

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

---

NO. LXXXI.—JULY, 1855.

---

## ART. I.—THE CRITICS ON JUDAS ISCARIOT.

*Judas Iscariot.* (Theological Essays and other Papers.) By THOMAS DE QUINCEY. 2 vols. Boston. 1854. Vol. I. Pp. 147–177.

*On the Treason of Judas Iscariot.* (Essays on some of the Dangers to Christian Faith; to which are subjoined Three Discourses, delivered on several occasions.) By RICHARD WHATELEY, D. D. London. 1839. Discourse III. Pp. 301–340.

*Mordplan zum Rebellentod Jesu. Judas beschlennight es.* (Das Leben Jesu, als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristentums.) Von Dr. H. E. G. PAULUS. Heidelberg. 1828. I. Th., 2 Abth., § 182.

*Jesus und Judas.* (Ein historisch-kritischer Versuch.) Von Dr. GUSTAV SCHOLLMAYER. Lüneburg. 1836.

“EVERYTHING,” says De Quincey, “connected with our ordinary conceptions of this man, of his real purposes, and of his ultimate fate, apparently is erroneous. That neither any motive of his, nor any ruling impulse, was tainted with the vulgar treachery imputed to him, appears probable from the strength of his remorse. And this view of his case comes recommended by so much of internal plausibility, that in Germany it has long since shaped itself into the following well-known hypothesis.”

Mr. De Quincey does the Germans less (or more) than justice by this intimation, that they have but a *single* hypothesis in relation to Judas. The fact is, that on this, as on most subjects about which the German scholars have set

themselves at work in earnest to speculate, they have almost as many theories as writers. It has been a favorite puzzle with them for the last twenty-five or thirty years, perhaps longer; and they have written a stack of treatises about it, in magazines, commentaries, and separate volumes. If any one is curious to examine the literature of the question, he will find in Hase's *Leben Jesu*, (§ 110,) two mortal pages full of *references* to their leading works and views; from that of Daub, who held Judas to be "an incarnate devil," (ein einge-fleischter Teufel,) whose crime placed him beyond even the *possibility* of the Divine Mercy, to that of Schmidt, who declares him to have been "an excellent man," (ein braver Mann,) actuated in all that he did by honest and honorable motives. Some twelve or fifteen of the principal authors, we find among the books of the late Dr. Neander, the examination of which—though we are truly thankful there are no more to be examined—we have found interesting, and, in one respect at least, instructive. After all the learning and ingenuity spent in solving the nodus, it seems to remain as much a nodus as ever. Or perhaps we shall speak quite as correctly if we say, it remains as plain and simple a matter on the face of the Scriptures, as it was before learning and ingenuity had made a puzzle of it.

The leading aim of a majority of these speculations has been, to extenuate the guilt of the treason, and abate the severity of that terrible sentence of reprobation which has been passed upon the traitor by the moral sense of mankind. So far, De Quincey is right. The hypotheses vary, of course, very much as the theological stand-point and the logical skill of their respective authors. A few endeavor to reconcile a lenient judgment of Judas with the tenor of Scripture, and with orthodox views of its authority, as inspired. Others, who hold the gospels to be a collection of myths, or imperfect traditions and reminiscences, are greatly perplexed with the discrepancies and improbabilities which they discover, but find no difficulty in clearing up matters at last, by applying *their own pre-conceptions* of the verisimilar and the morally right. But by far the largest number are of those, who professing to accept the sacred writers as tolerably reliable witnesses in mere matters of fact, feel free to sit in judgment on their *opinions*, especially in a matter so closely related to the fate of their idolized Master, and so likely therefore to excite their personal feelings. John, in particular, whose testimony on some points is inconveniently explicit, has been pretty faithfully handled by some of these writers, for allowing his warm affection for Christ, to impair the exactness of his



memory and to color his characterizations of his unfortunate fellow-disciple.

With regard to the motive of Judas, there is a single (negative) point of agreement among these theorists. It was *not* avarice. It was no such low, sordid, perfidious grasping after the wages of iniquity, as it has been usually considered. This is "the common (the *vulgar*) view," lying on the mere surface, requiring no exegetical acumen or power of historical reconstruction to develop it, and quite incompatible with certain aspects of heroic greatness, which many discover in the conception of his plan, the manner of its execution, and the remorse which followed.\* What the motive *was*, is another question. Here every man goes his own way; and every man's way is right—in his own sight.

According to some, Judas was influenced by a simple *sense of duty*, patriotic and religious. He had become a follower of Jesus, under a conviction that He was the promised Messiah, who, according to the prevalent Jewish idea, was to free Israel from the yoke of Roman bondage, restore the ancient polity to more than its ancient glory, and secure for it ascendancy and dominion throughout the world. But he could not fail to perceive, more and more clearly as time wore on, that this was not at all the purpose of our Lord; that He not only repudiated all appeal to physical force, and enjoined the submission due to Cæsar, but was disseminating ideas, and founding a sect, directly hostile to the national religion and its constituted authorities. The struggle in the bosom of Judas, therefore, was between patriotism and friendship, between the claims of public and private duty. And when the crisis came, in which he *must* be found definitively on one side or the other, he felt compelled to sacrifice the latter. It was not until he saw the beloved Master, whom he had surrendered to the *national authorities*, by them perfidiously given over into the hands of the hated *Romans* for a shameful death, that he felt that he had done wrong, and, with a generous fervor of remorse, passed upon himself that judgment whose terrible severity, modern candor and charity refuse to sanction. The unfavorable representations in the gospels are referred to the very natural bias of the authors, and rejected, one by one, on the score of intrinsic improbabilities or irreconcilable discrepancies.†

\* — "ging dieser tragische Character unter, auch noch im Tode der Verzweiflung ein Trümmer apostolischer Grösse." Hase, *Leb. Jes.*, p. 231. Cp. Schollmeyer, *Jes. u. Jud.*, p. 52.

† See this view fully drawn out (ex contr.) by Daub. *Judas Iscariot, oder d. Böse in Verhältniss z. Guten*, pp. 23–29.

Others, admitting in various degrees the culpability of Judas, plead for a more charitable estimate of it. His faith was too weak, no doubt. His mind, like those of his fellow-disciples, preoccupied with *Jewish* conceptions of the Messiah and His kingdom, and consequently disappointed and perplexed by our Saviour's pacific policy, was peculiarly liable to the assaults of temptation or the lapses of human frailty. It might have been *fear* then, that betrayed him into the unfortunate step—fear for his personal safety, so dreadfully compromised in the storm of peril now gathering over his Master's head—fear, fostered by the Saviour's repeated predictions of His approaching fate, and startled into violent activity by His declaration at the supper in Bethany, that His body had now been anointed for its *burial*\*—fear, a most natural weakness certainly, one which a little after led Peter to deny his Lord, and all the other disciples to forsake Him and flee; and which influenced Judas *earlier*, only perhaps because he was more far-seeing than they, and prompted him to a more daring measure of self-protection because he was a man of larger resources and of greater nerve.

According to others, it was *wounded pride* and a feeling of *resentment*. He could not brook the Saviour's repeated intimations of distrust and dislike, pointed personally at him, and the comparative reserve which must have been manifest in the intercourse of his fellow-disciples with him.† He was especially stung by the mortifying rebuke which he received in the affair of the anointing at Bethany, (John 12: 4–8,) and which, falling suddenly on a mind already morbidly affected towards Jesus, inflamed it to this hasty act of passion: ‡ an act, quite indefensible in itself, to be sure, yet not wholly unnatural under the circumstances, and at least indicative of some sense of honor, however erroneous.

Another class find the most probable explanation in a supposed *presumptuous* determination of Judas, to solve the painful doubts which racked his soul, on questions so vitally affecting not merely his own destinies, but those of his nation and the world, by a bold appeal to the Divine judgment.§

\* Henneberg, *Kommentar über d. Geschichte d. Leiden u. d. Todes Jesu*, p. 32.

† Krummacher, *über Geist u. Form d. evang. Geschichte*, pp. 298, seq. Neander's view is somewhat similar, but more profoundly conceived. He denies that Judas was impelled by avarice, or by the hope of compelling Christ to establish His visible kingdom; and inclines to believe that he was actuated by "a gradually developed hostility," originating in a want of spiritual sympathy, and ending in a fixed personal aversion. See his *Life of Christ*, § 264.

‡ Kaiser, *Bibl. Theol.*, I., 249. Greiling, *Leb. Jes.*, p. 359, seq. Cf. Klopstock's *Messias*.

§ —"bereits zweifelnd und verstimmt, Judas wollte die Sache auf ein Gottesurtheil stellen." Hase, *Leb. Jes.*, § 110, with references to "Neander, p. 632, seq. Cf. Thies, *Komm.*, B. I., p. 346;" which we have not been able to verify.

"I will bring this matter to a test," said he. "If this be the Son of God, God will protect His own; if not, his blood be upon his own head." In this purpose he might have been strengthened by a very natural inference from intimations which repeatedly fell from our Lord, (as, *e. g.*, Matt. 16: 21 seq., 20: 18, 19, Lu. 18: 31, &c.,) importing that his ultimate triumph was to spring out of the bosom of apparent defeat, and finally confirmed, by his interpreting the words with which he was dismissed to the actual execution of it, ("*What thou doest, do quickly,*") as a direct approval from his Master.\*

Or, (say some,) it might have been *sheer impatience* in a spirit naturally ardent, ambitious, excitable, and consequently restless and uneasy, chafing under the compulsory inaction and obscurity to which the Saviour's policy seemed to doom His followers, and bent upon a change.†

But perhaps the most popular hypothesis is the one referred to by De Quincey, which represents Judas as seeking to promote *a good end by bad means*. He saw the cause to which he had devoted his all in peril of overthrow, through the strange supineness of our Lord, and the active malice of His enemies; and he hoped, by one politic stroke, to compel the former to take some decisive step,‡ and to entrap the latter into the fatal catastrophe of an uncontrollable popular tumult. It was the error of *mere worldly wisdom*, striving to fight a spiritual warfare with carnal weapons. It was the folly of *craft and deception*, which overreach themselves. At the very worst, it was the sin of a *daring self-confidence*, that presumed to sit in judgment on his Master's policy, and to attempt the correction of its errors. It was anything but sordid self-seeking, anything but a vulgar love of pelf, anything but a cruel or reckless perfidy—anything, in short, but the want of sincere love to Christ and His cause, or of an earnest and hopeful desire that still, out of all the gloom which environed it, and over all the assaults of its powerful adversaries, that cause might rise triumphant and be established in glorious perpetuity.

It will be seen at a glance, that to a great extent, these theories are mutually destructive. But it is not our purpose to attempt an estimate of their comparative value. For this,

\* See Strauss, *Leb. Jes.*, II., 393.

† Jud. hatte ein empfängliches, lebhaften Eindrücken offenes, aber eben deshalb leicht bewegliches, unbefestigtes, . . . furchtbar elastisches Gemüth. *Ungeduld* riss ihn u. s. w. Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterb.*, (Art. Judas,) I., 750. Cf. Lechtlen, *de culpa Judae*, 813, 8.

‡ Particularly, to make some transcendent display of his miracle-power. See Niemeyer, *Charakterist.*, I., 125, seq., K. C. L. Schmidt, *exeg. Beiträge*, I., 2, 5.



we have neither the space nor the requisite materials. We believe that almost every one of them contains more of truth than its opponents admit, and that all are wrong in the most essential particular; *viz.*, in ignoring the most characteristic trait of the man and most influential motive to the act, as this lies plainly on the face of the sacred narrative and is at once recognized by the simple common sense of unsophisticated readers. It is chiefly as illustrating the reliableness of such impressions, received in the mere intelligent perusal of the Scriptures, that we prize the results of our own investigation. It is well, indeed, that these first impressions should be tried by the severest tests of logic and exegesis; and sometimes, no doubt, the results will require, or justify a modification of them. But, to one who considers the use for which the Scriptures are intended, it is a most gratifying fact, that, in the great majority of instances, these learned speculations have proved their utility, not by overthrowing, but by finally confirming "the common view."

This may be sufficiently shown in the present case, we think, by the scrutiny of a single one of the theories broached. We select the one last mentioned, as in itself, perhaps, the most plausible, and certainly sanctioned by the most influential names. The earliest expositor of it that we have met with, (perhaps its originator,) is Paulus;\* the most elaborate is Schollmeyer,† in the volume whose title we have placed at the head of our article. With some differences of detail, the two distinguished Englishmen there named, must also be added to the list of its advocates.

The leading features of the theory we can not better exhibit than in the clear and beautiful exposition of it by De Quincey, whose pen touches nothing that it does not adorn.

"Believing, as Judas did, that Christ contemplated the establishment of a temporal kingdom, the restoration in fact, of David's throne; believing, also, that all the conditions toward the realization of such a scheme, met and centered in the person of Christ, when viewed in relation to the circumstances of the times; what was it that, upon any solution intelligible to Judas, neutralized so grand a scene of promise? Simply and obviously, to a man with the views of Judas, it was the character of Christ himself, sublimely over-gifted, for purposes of speculation, but like Shakspeare's great creation of Prince Hamlet, not commensurately endowed for the business of action and the sudden emergencies of life. Indecision and doubt (such was the interpretation of Judas) crept over the faculties of the Divine Man, as often as

---

\* In his *Leben Jesu* above referred to, (Heidelberg, 1828;) and also in his *exeg. Handbuch über d. drei ersten Evangelien*, III., 451-477, (1833.) We do not know whether it was broached in his *Commentar üb. de Neu. Test.*, (Jena, 1800-4.)

† The "young but promising theologian," so pointedly referred to by Neander, *Life of Christ*, § 264.

he was summoned away from his own natural Sabbath of heavenly contemplation, to the gross necessities of action. It became important, therefore, according to the views adopted by Judas, that his Master should be precipitated into action by a force from without, and thrown into the centre of some popular movement, such as, once beginning to revolve, could not afterward be suspended or checked." Page 148.

"His object was *audacious* in a high degree, but (according to the theory I am explaining) for that very reason, *not treacherous at all*. The more that he was liable to the reproach of audacity, the less can he be suspected of perfidy. He supposed himself executing the very innermost purposes of Christ, but with an energy which it was the characteristic infirmity of Christ to want. His hope was, that, when at length actually arrested by the Jewish authorities, Christ would no longer vacillate; he would be forced into giving the signal to the populace of Jerusalem, who would then have arisen unanimously, for the double purpose of placing Christ at the head of an insurrectionary movement, and of throwing off the Roman yoke. As regards the worldly prospects of this scheme, it is by no means improbable that Iscariot was right." Page 151.

With this compare the following language of Dr. Whately :

"It was natural for an ambitious and worldly man like Judas, to expect that, by putting his Master into the hands of his enemies, he should force him to make such a display of power, as would at once lead to his being triumphantly seated on the throne of David as a great and powerful prince. And he probably expected, that he, Judas, should be both pardoned and nobly rewarded, for having thus been the means, though in an unauthorized way, of raising his Master to that earthly splendor, which to worldly men, is the greatest object of desire." Page 316.

To this purpose of Judas, Paulus assigns a specific historical inception. Referring to the resolution of the assembled priests and rulers (Matt. 26 : 35) to arrest Jesus, but not openly, nor on the feast day, he says :

"The cunning Judas was struck by this peculiarity, that while the enemies of Jesus were determined secretly to take him, they did not dare to attempt it *during the feast*, when, on account of the numerous strangers in the city, a tumult was to be apprehended. Now, thought he, the thing they purpose, must be just that which will most injure us. If Jesus should be arrested by stratagem, *after the feast*, when he can no longer be rescued by a popular commotion, then all this grand Messianic scheme comes to the ground, and, with it, all my hopes. Come now, I must make them seize him *during the feast*. Then the people will rise ; and he, my kind-hearted Master, opposed as he is to all use of force, must permit himself to be rescued by the force of the people, and, spite of himself, will become a leader of the people."\*

*Leb. Jes., I., 2, 145.*

The logical consequences of this view in respect to the *character* of Judas, are not fully assumed by either Paulus or Whately ; who both concede the covetous disposition of Judas, although they represent other motives as predominant

---

\* Cf. Schollm., *J. und J.*, page 36, seq.

in the act of betrayal.\* Schollmeyer and De Quincey carry out the view with a greater consistency and completeness; the latter, indeed, describing it as a theory of "the Germans," but in such terms as imply his own unqualified acquiescence. Thus, in addition to the language already quoted, he says:

"The whole construction of Iscariot's conduct, as arising, not out of perfidy, but out of his sincere belief that some quickening impulse was called for by a morbid feature in Christ's temperament—all this, I believe, was originally due to the Germans; and it is *an important correction*, for it must always be important to recall *within the fold of Christian forgiveness*, any one who has long been sequestered from human charity, and has tenanted a Pariah grave. . . . If there is a doubt affecting his case, he is entitled to the benefit of that doubt; and if he has suffered to any extent, *we ought*, not to revise and mitigate his sentence merely, but to *dismiss him from the bar*." Page 153.

Dr. S. employs language, if not stronger, still more explicit. We quote from his closing pages:

"Judas appears, neither as a covetous and ambitious, nor as a revengeful and malignant man; nor as a man in whom evil was predominant; least of all, as a wholly depraved character, given over to evil beyond the possibility of salvation. Like his fellow-disciples, though perhaps more than they, he is involved in the ideas then prevailing respecting the Messiah. Like them, too, he believed, that, in the person of Jesus, he saw the Messianic idea realized, the Messianic hope fulfilled. And when his expectations of the establishment of an earthly empire by the Messiah, seemed about to be frustrated through the fury of his adversaries, *so strong was his faith*, that he resolved to do, on his own responsibility, what he supposed that Jesus would never spontaneously authorize. . . . *His love for Jesus*, against whose life, blows long aimed, seemed now about to take effect, leads him to the rash determination, by the act of betrayal, to bring about that result for which he had so long hoped; to realize that idea which he had so fondly cherished in his own bosom. In these circumstances, with all his thoughts and endeavors bent on effecting the recognition and elevation of Jesus as the Messiah, *he lost sight of this*, that the means by which he hoped to attain his object, were unlawful, and such as would give pain to his Master, and offence to his fellow-disciples. . . . His faith in Jesus and his love for him, together with *the goodness of his intentions*, and the *subjective blamelessness of his efforts*—for, in the hallucination which possessed him, he doubtless imagined that he was performing a great and glorious work—appears finally, and most touchingly, in the repentance he exhibits on finding himself so terribly disappointed; and the same rash disposition, which had led him to the commission of the act without due consideration, without deliberativeness or discretion, now drives him to despair and to suicide. *Pity Judas we must*, as an unfortunate, rash, deluded man; *but we can not condemn him*." Page 63, seq.

---

\* Thus Dr. Whately: "There is no reason for concluding, as unreflecting readers often do, that he was influenced solely by the paltry bribe of thirty pieces of silver." Page 313. "The difference between Iscariot and his fellow-apostles, was, that though all had the same expectations, *he dared to act on his conjectures*." Page 319.



In another place, he thus sums up the points of censure, to which he thinks Judas obnoxious:

"Such is the tragical end of a man, who followed out a daring idea and a rash plan for its realization, without inquiring whether on the whole it was feasible, without scrutinizing *the means* which he had to employ, without considering the consequences in which (in case of failure) they would involve not only himself, but HIM also, whose exaltation was the object he aimed at. 'Terribly betrayed by himself *and by fate*, perished this tragic character; still, even in his death of despair, a wreck of APOSTOLIC GREATNESS.'"\*  
Page 52.

This is all very fine, certainly; very generous, and very poetic. What a pity, we are ready to exclaim, that it has not a particle of foundation in Scripture! Nevertheless, it must be conceded, that this want of Scriptural foundation is, in our view, a very fatal objection. If Judas did really go through the mental process which is here attributed to him; if his great object were the exaltation of Christ, and his controlling principles love and faith, why is it that no one of the four evangelists drops a hint to that effect? Why did Judas himself "die and give no sign?" Engaging in an enterprise so praiseworthy in its aims, yet so liable to be misunderstood, why did he make no confidant *before*, and offer no explanation *after*? It is an instinct of human nature to vindicate itself from unmerited blame, and shield its posthumous memory from infamy. And had Judas possessed the elevation of character here attributed to him, and the consciousness of a noble aim in what he had done, he could not, we believe, have left the world without one anguished cry of self-justification: "I meant it for good, though it has come to this terrible end! Call it folly, if you will; call it madness, audacity, presumption, but do not call it perfidy, for perfidy it was not! Call it not treason to my beloved Master, for His advancement was my single aim!" Or, if Judas in the wildness of his despair, might have judged himself with gratuitous harshness, and been reckless of the opinion of mankind, why should his brethren have done the same! They knew, at least, all that they have recorded of his case—all therefore, that his modern apologists know; and a thousand fold more they knew, which they have not recorded, and much of which could not be conveyed in words, to guide their judgment. Where then, was their *sagacity*, if, with all these advantages, they left the solution to be guessed out in the nineteenth century; and where either their *honesty* or their *humanity*, if, discovering the truth, they failed to give their

---

\* Words of Hase, *Leb. Jes.*, p. 231.

unfortunate fellow-disciple the full benefit of its avowal? For ourselves, throwing entirely out of account the inspiration of the evangelists, we can not bring ourselves to doubt, that they fully understood their man, and have told his story in the most favorable manner possible for him.

Paulus admits, indeed, that the sacred narrative does not "expressly" develop such a mental process, as his hypothesis attributes to Judas.\* But more than this is true. It does not even suggest it. Thousands of intelligent minds, in different lands, and through successive ages, have pondered the history without even dreaming of it. It is confessedly a *discovery*, a discovery of the present century, and made by men who were searching the Scriptures for startling and unsuspected novelties.†

Nor is the testimony of the evangelists merely negative. They tell a *positive* story—simple and self-consistent, comprehensive, and complete; the world knows it by heart, and will not readily unlearn it. In a few unstudied master-strokes, according to their wont, they sketch a character possessing a definite and unmistakeable individuality; and, to make way for the Judas of the hypothesis, the Judas of the history must first be blotted out.

Let us collect into a single picture the scattered elements of this Scriptural account, and allow it to make its own impression.

Judas was one of the chosen "twelve," separated by our Lord from the common mass of His followers, *to be with Him*, to preach under His direction, and to work miracles. (Mark 3: 13-19.) In this intimate and endearing relation he

\* Diesen Gedankengang in Judas Gemüth entwickelt die ausdrückliche Geschichte allerdings nicht. P. 148. Cf. Schollmeyer: Wir können nur durch Vermuthung entdecken, u. s. w., p. 29.

† The *recency* of all these apologies for Judas, furnishes of itself, strong presumptive evidence that none of them is well-founded. Theophylact is the only ancient name quoted; and he, without rejecting the common view, merely suggests that Judas might have imagined that his Master would preserve himself by miracles; a highly probable suggestion.

But Judas did not want vindicators even in the earliest ages. And, significantly enough, they are found among the most extravagant and paradoxical of all the antinomian Gnostics, in that sect which rejoiced in the name of *Cainites*. Regarding Jehovah as not only distinct from, but hostile to the Supreme God, they held in special honor all men, who, in the past history of the race, had distinguished themselves by daring opposition to His government. To Cain, as the first avowed rebel, they assigned the chief place, and owned him as their leader. It was in strict consistency with their strange theology, that they should revere the memory of Judas. He alone of the disciples had attained to the true Gnosis; and, in procuring the death of Jesus, he was influenced not merely by justifiable motives, but by the highest possible motive; *viz.*, to strike a fatal blow at the supremacy of Jaldabaoth, the mundane Demiurge, the hated Jehovah of the Jews. See Neander, *Hist. Christ. Relig.* etc., (Torrey's transl.) I., 448.

continued throughout the Saviour's ministry, and knew Him perfectly in His public and His private life. He was steward and treasurer to the sacred fraternity—purveyor for their frugal board, and almoner of their charities to the poor, (John 12: 7, 13: 29.) But he was *a devil* among the chosen, (6: 70,) *unclean* among the clean, (13: 10, 11, and, in his office of special trust, *a thief*, not caring for the poor (12: 6.) At length Satan entered into him, (Luke 22: 3,) and put it into his heart to betray his Master to his enemies, (John 13: 2.) Jesus had discerned the germs of this treachery in him from the first, and, without mentioning his name, had marked his character, a full year before these germs had ripened into definite purpose and outward act, (John 6: 64, 71;) and, from that time forth, He began to show His disciples explicitly, that He was to be *betrayed* into the hands of His enemies at Jerusalem, and by them put to death, (Mat. 16: 21, 17: 22, 20: 18; Luke 9: 44, 18: 31.)

Those enemies were the Jewish priests and rulers—the aristocracy, in general, of church, state, and school—who, hating His doctrine because it was against themselves, and alarmed at his increasing influence, sought for some plausible pretext to lay hands upon Him, and to destroy Him; and were restrained only by fear of the people, (John 7: 30–32, Luke 19: 47, 48; 20: 19–26; John 12: 19.) At length, they called a council at the house of Caiaphas the high priest, and, having resolved on putting Him to death, consulted how they might take Him by craft; but they said, “Not on the feast-day, lest the people rise.” (John 11: 47–53; Mat. 26: 3–5; Mark 14: 1, 2.) Jesus therefore, avoided all needless exposure during his last visit to Jerusalem; remaining in the city only during the day, (when he taught in the temple,) and at night retiring to private resorts in the neighboring villages and the Mount of Olives, (Luke 21: 37, 38. Cf. Mat. chaps. 21–24; Mark chaps. 11–13; Luke chaps. 19–21, *passim*.)

It was (probably) on the *eve* of the second day, (*i. e.*, Sunday evening,\*) in that last week of our Lord's life, that a supper was made Him at the house of Simon, in Bethany, at which Mary anointed His head and feet with very precious ointment. At this costly expression of love, Judas (either

---

\* Following the order of events most naturally indicated by John (12: 1.) Others preferring that suggested by Mat. and Mar., say on the following Wednesday. The reasons for the former opinion are given in full by Michaelis; (*vid.* Townsend, *Arrangm. of N. Test.* Part V., note 37;) those for the latter are well stated by Dr. Robinson, *Gr. Harmony*, P. VII., § 131, note. The question is of no essential importance in the present discussion.



alone or with some others,\*) was indignant, and exclaimed: "Why this waste? It might have been sold for three hundred denaria, and given to the poor." This he said *not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief,†* and had the bag, and *used to take‡ what was put therein.* But Jesus said: "Let her alone. She has wrought a good work on me. The poor you have always with you; but me you have not always. She has anointed my body for its burial." (John 12: 1-8; Mat. 26: 6-13; Mark 14: 3-9.) Then entered Satan into Judas; and he went to the chief priests, and said: "What will you give me, and I will deliver him to you? And when they heard it, they were glad and promised to give him money. "Thirty pieces of silver" was the price agreed on; and from that time he

\* We think, alone. Mat. and Mark do not particularize, but attribute both the feeling and the words, Matthew to "His disciples," Mark to "some" there present. John who seems to have had the earlier account before him when he wrote, declares expressly that it was *Judas* who used the words; and it is natural to apply the same limitation in respect to the feeling which they express. Cf. Neand., *Life of Christ*, p. 352, note. Dr. A. Clarke, *Comm. in loc.*

† This explicit testimony of John is very embarrassing to the apologists of Judas. Those who can attribute it to the writer's imperfect memory or bias of feeling, get along with it the most comfortably. Schollmeyer's evasion is lame. Κλέπτης (he says) does not mean *thief*, but *rogue*, (*Schalk*,) a *secret, deceptive man*. But (1.) he gives no single instance of such a sense being given to the noun. The secondary senses of the verb κλέπτεσθαι (like our *steal off, steal away*, &c.) do not reach the case. (2.) If John wanted to call him *thief*, this is just the word to use. Its use in Scriptures is very common, and always in that sense. Whereas, even admitting the secondary sense to be sometimes found, (v. Soph. Aj., 1135,) it would not naturally be used in that sense in simple narrative, and (as here) absolutely. (3.) Even substituting the word *rogue*, it is difficult to see how Judas would be helped, unless we could get rid of the rest of the verse. See next note.

‡ *Used to take.* The proper rendering, we think, of ἵβασταίεν, (John 12: 6.) Eng. Ver. *bare*. The primary signification of βαστάζειν seems to be *to lift, raise, take up*, (Od. 11, 594. 21, 405. trop. τὰ λὰυδ, Pind. O. 12, 27.) Hence 2. *to take*, in general, (scil. *from, to, away, along*, &c.,) expressive of *action* and implying motion; and 3. *to bear, to sustain*, &c., expressive merely of *relation* without motion.

In the second sense, it corresponds exactly to our *take*, but may often be translated by *bear—bear along, carry*; in the third, to our *bear—bear up, sustain*. In both senses, it is common in N. T.

*E. g.*, 1. *to take (up)* John 10: 31, Mat. 3: 11, (*away*) John 20: 15, (*along*, transl. *carry, bear*,) John 19: 17, Mark 14: 13, Luke 10: 4, (*in*) John 16: 12, (*to or before*) Acts 9: 15.

2. *to bear (up—sustain)* Luke 7: 14, Acts 15: 10, Gal. 6: 2, 5, 17; (*with—endure, suffer*) Mat. 8: 17, Rom. 15: 1.

Either sense is admissible in John 12: 6; but the former better suits the connection. (a) As Dr. A. Clarke well observes, when we have been told that Judas had (ἔχε, held, kept) the bag, we surely need not to be informed that he *carried* (was the bearer of) what was in it. Why speak of the contents at all, and with another verb, unless an essentially different action was to be asserted? (b) It is hardly possible to avoid understanding this as epexegetical of κλέπτης. (c) The whole verse purports to assign the motive of Judas's question (v. 5.) What motive is assigned, if not a better chance for *peculation*? Transl., therefore, *take* euphem. for *steal, embezzle*. Cf. Jos. Ant. 8, 2, 2; 9, 4, 5; 12, 5, 4; Pol. 1, 48, 2.

sought for an opportunity to betray his Master in the absence of the multitude, (Mat. 26: 14-16; Mark 14: 10, 11; Luke 22: 3-6.)

Such an opportunity, however, did not occur, for the reasons above-mentioned, until the eve of the sixth day of the week, (*i. e.*, Thursday evening;) at which time Jesus, desiring to keep the passover with His disciples, had come for that purpose into the city. They sat down together, and supped. It was an affecting scene. Never were his words so tender; never were His acts so significant and instructive. He knew that His hour was come. He knew that the hand of His betrayer was with Him on the table. His heart was trembling, full of love and grief. "Ye are clean," said he, "but not all. He that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up His heel against me." And He was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of *you* shall betray me. And the disciples were exceeding sorrowful, and looked upon one another, and began every one of them to say, "Lord is it I?" "It is one of *the twelve*," said he, "one that dippeth with me in the dish. The Son of Man goeth as it is written of Him; but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! Good were it for that man, if he had never been born." Then John who reclined next to Jesus at the table, leaning back against His breast, asked him privately, "Lord, who is it?" And Jesus, in the same way, replied, "It is he to whom I give this sop." He dipped and gave the sop to Judas, adding aloud, "What thou doest, do quickly." With Satan in his heart, Judas immediately went out: and it was night. (Mat. 26: 17-25; Mark 14: 12-21; Luke 22: 7-23; John 13: 1-30.)

It was night, and through dark and empty streets—citizens and strangers being all within doors, celebrating the great national rites,—Judas wends his solitary way to the chief priests, to inform them that the desired opportunity has come, that their long hunted victim is within their grasp. He obtains a band of armed men, with whom he goes out against his Master, as against a thief. *He* meanwhile, and His disciples, having concluded their repast, had left the place and the city. But Judas tracks them through the gate, across the brook Cedron, to the foot of Olivet, and finally to the garden of Gethsemane—a spot, known to Judas as a familiar resort of our Lord, and hallowed in the history of our redemption by the mysterious agonies which it had already witnessed on that dreadful night. And now the anguish-throes had for a season left the sufferer's soul. An angel has been sent to strengthen Him; and the disciples,

worn out with excitement, grief and watching, have sunk to a leaden slumber. Suddenly, lights flash athwart the gloom, and the stillness is broken. Torches and lanterns waving in the distance! the rattle of swords and staves! the tramp of approaching feet! and Judas enters with his posse at his heels. "Hail, Master!" and a kiss, complete the crime of Judas. "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss!" is the only utterance of his Master's broken heart. Then they who were with him laid hold upon Jesus, and led him away to the assembled and waiting council. (John 18: 1-12; Mat. 26: 47-57; Luke 22: 47-54.)

We need not follow the history of the Saviour. His trial was a short one; the result, a foregone conclusion: and before another evening His lacerated body lay in the grave. But what became of Judas? Two dismal words close up his earthly history, REMORSE and SUICIDE; and the latest record of him, is, that he went to his own place. (Mat. 27: 3-5; Acts 1: 16-25.)

Such is the Judas of Scripture—a gloomy portrait, but not ours—in the most mournful of earthly tragedies, a figure second only to the chief in prominence, and the part he acted preëminently dark. The individual strokes of the picture may be isolated and refined away; but look upon them as a whole, and its significance can not be evaded. A chosen friend, an honored intimate of the Son of God, who had known His virtues, shared his counsels, and experienced His kindnesses daily for more than two years, not merely forsakes, but turns against Him in the crisis of his sad earthly destiny, becomes an active participant in the measures employed to ensnare Him, and finally delivers Him over into the hands of powerful enemies, thirsting for His blood. And if we ask what could have led him to do this nefarious thing, in addition to the general statement that "the devil put it into his heart," we have specifically the language of his own proposals, "*What will ye give me and I will?*" and the fact that they struck a *bargain* with him for thirty pieces. And that this form of the transaction was not accidental, nor a mere *pretence* of covetousness,\* but *characteristic of the man*, is attested by the revelations of the supper at Bethany. No hint of any other motive is anywhere given. He pleads no sense of patriotic or religious duty; he makes no charges of

---

\* "His acceptance of the bribe is easily accounted for. He must, of course, have presented himself, in his conference with the chief priest, as hostile to his Master. His acceptance of money from them . . . must have been the most effectual way of *blinding them to his real design*." Whateley, p. 314, note.



schism or sedition against his Lord; on the contrary he owns that he has betrayed the innocent blood. He utters no solemn appeal to Deity to decide, in this great issue, on the side of truth. He acts in no sudden paroxysm of fear or passion; he takes his measures deliberately, before any appearance of imminent danger, and, for days successively, seeks for an opportunity to execute them "conveniently." Least of all does it appear in any part of this history, "expressly" or by remotest implication, that he did all this out of faith and love towards Jesus, for the purpose of outwitting his enemies, and in the expectation that it would result in the establishment of the Messianic kingdom, and his own well earned reward as a prime agent of its inauguration! On the other hand, the solemn and sorrowful predictions made by our Lord for a whole year previous, and down to the very night of its occurrence—predictions of His approaching betrayal and its fatal consequences to Himself—preclude the *possibility* of Judas having acted under any such delusion; and we are cut off from every other explanation of the act than that which is but too distinctly suggested by the simple record itself: "*They* promised to give him MONEY, and *he* sought how he might conveniently betray Him."

But, it is urged, "the narrative is very brief: we can not suppose that it contains all that belongs to the case." The greater the importance, we reply, to be attached to what it does contain. When men must tell a whole story in few words, they aim to tell the most essential thing. No one indeed can doubt, from what we know of human nature universally, that a multitude of conflicting thoughts and passions must have mingled in the tumult of Judas's bosom, amidst which the guilty purpose was born and matured. No doubt, he more or less deceived himself in relation to the motive which influenced him; and a consideration of all the connected circumstances will doubtless throw light on the *probable* mode of this self-deception. But the actual record is not conjecture, is not inference; it is history. It is the consenting testimony of those who knew Judas better than he knew himself, and who, not professing to give a complete psychological history of the man or his act, must still be understood as suggesting *the key* to both, as giving not merely the truth, but that which is central and most characteristic of the whole. In that record, Judas appears as A HIRED TRAITOR: for so much money, he *sold* himself, his principles, and his Master, and such a Master! Over a crime like this, we can not consent to throw a veil of palliation. We can give no possible definition of the word *perfidy*, which would exclude

this act; we can conceive no possible form of perfidy, which would more justly be branded as *vulgar*; and its vulgarity is, to us, very far from being its most odious feature.

The objections to the common view, are mainly, three: the *first*, drawn from the confidential relations in which Jesus retained Judas up to the time of the betrayal; the *second*, from the smallness of the sum paid him by the Sanhedrim; and the *third*, from the pungency of his subsequent remorse. These are far from having the weight which has been attributed to them: as we hope to show. But we wish first to recur to a remark thrown out above, that it is not necessary to suppose, nor in the nature of things probable, that Judas was *wholly* governed by any *single* motive. The common view does not require this; though much of the adverse reasoning seems to assume that it does. Such is not human nature; such are not the men we meet with in Shakespeare, in the Bible, or the real world, though they abound in bad poetry, false history, and shallow criticism; such, especially, is not the mental process, through which men pass to the commission of great crime. We characterize and classify men according to their predominant traits; but in every man are to be found the elements of every other, and it is true only as a rhetorical exaggeration, that "the master-passion swallows up the rest." It subsidizes and controls, but it does not destroy them; and its sway over them is often secret and unsuspected. All that it can make subservient to its gratification, directly or indirectly, it rather stimulates to greater activity, and among these, pushes the good (or whatever can be regarded as such) to a prominence, in the sphere of self-consciousness, which imposes upon the subject of them even more readily and more perfectly than others. He is in perilous ignorance of the devices of a depraved heart, who knows not how busy and how adroit it is—especially when great sins are to be committed—in weaving pretexts and specious disguises, behind which the master-iniquity may hide its hateful front and rule under other names and semblances of virtue. That Judas so deceived himself, is more than probable. While *we* contemplate his act just as it is—just as it stands, stripped of all disguises, in the revealing light of truth—it is not at all necessary to suppose that *he* viewed it in the same light, or had, in advance at least, any adequate conception of its enormity. Else, were he a fiend, and not a man.

If, moreover, we examine the various hypotheses respecting him, we find scarcely one that is not more or less favored by some attending circumstances. We can trace, in the pecu-

liarities of his position and in the state of things about him, powerful stimulants alike to faith and distrust, to love and to resentment, to fear and to hope, to feelings of disappointment and impatience, to the stirrings of ambition and enterprise, the love of action, and the spirit of intrigue. As he was *a man*, and thus solicited, we can readily believe that all these motives, in various degrees and forms, in succession, in unison, or in conflict, but always in subservience to the *ruling* impulse, may have blended in his mind and helped to shape the result.

We see no reason, for instance, to suppose (with Daub) that Judas was hypocritical from the beginning, in his profession of faith in the Messiahship of Christ, and of devotion to His cause. On the other hand, we have no proof whatever that his faith, though sincere, sprang from any radical moral sympathy with the Redeemer, or any profound sense of his own moral wants; nor that his attachment to the cause had any higher inspiration than its connection with his hopes of earthly gain and aggrandizement. Learning from later developments how intensely selfish and sordid he became, we reasonably suspect that, from the outset, he was drawn to Jesus by the brilliant anticipation of sitting on one of the twelve promised thrones of emancipated Israel, of swaying the sceptre, and reveling in the affluence of a Messianic satrap. He identified himself with the humble fortunes of Christ, in the *sincere conviction* that they would be but temporarily so. He took the difficult and responsible post of treasurer, and devoted himself, no doubt assiduously, to husbanding the limited finances of the wandering fraternity—a kind of business, for which, we may safely presume he had a more decided turn than for preaching the gospel or casting out devils—very much as we may suppose that Edward Hyde did in the ragged court of the exiled Charles Stuart, with a shrewd prophetic eye to the emoluments and dignities with which he was afterwards to be loaded by King Charles II., of England.

We are constantly reminded, to be sure, that his fellow-disciples committed precisely the same error with Judas, in their expectation of a temporal sovereignty for Christ. But such a misapprehension was not necessarily incompatible, either in him or them, with a moral preparedness for another and a nobler reign; which preparedness, however, subsequent developments show that they possessed, and that he did not. It was the glory of their beloved Lord which *they* discerned, and chiefly desired in the splendors of that expected kingdom, whose magnificence and might were to be the



brilliant attestations that this was "HE whose right it is to reign." It was the splendor of the kingdom—its wealth and power and glittering rewards for faithful ministers and adherents—that *Judas* saw, and chiefly loved, in Christ. The outward manifestations might for a time be scarcely distinguishable; but the intrinsic difference was radical, and time, which proves all things, brought it at length to light. When the last hope of an earthly triumph was extinguished, Judas was ready to abandon Christ, and to go over to the winning side. *They* never turned against Him. They never even "forsook" Him, *in heart*. Though, when the Shepherd was smitten, the frightened sheep were scattered, yet had they no one else to whom to go. Still, at a distance, they turned to gaze and wonder and weep at His sufferings and death; they gathered about His sepulchre, and were in waiting to welcome His reappearing. Even Peter, though sudden fright forced from him a denial of his Lord, was melted in an instant to repentance—not petrified, as Judas, in *remorse*—and hesitated not, at the very first opportunity, to throw himself at the feet of Jesus with: "Lord, thou knowest all things; *thou knowest* that I love thee!"

The recognition of the *sincerity* of Judas's original profession, obviates in a great measure the force of the first and strongest of the above named objections to the common view, *viz.*, that *Jesus should have received and retained him among the twelve*. "If," says Neander,\* "the avarice of Judas was so intense, it is difficult to conceive how Christ, whose piercing glance penetrated the recesses of men's hearts, could have received him into the number of His disciples." But the view we advocate does not assume his avarice to have been "*so intense*" at the outset of his career. The difference between him and his companions was at that time an undeveloped difference. Neither he, nor they were conscious, or probably could have been made so then, of any essential dissimilarity in their views, feelings, or purposes. He was as earnest as they in his devotion to Christ, and as sincere; he met all the tests of discipleship which in the nature of the case could yet be applied. Had he been rejected on the ground of sins which he had never committed, of which at that time he was incapable, and at the very mention of which he might have exclaimed with unaffected horror: "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?"—would not he and they together have resented it as a piece of gratuitous and cruel injustice? As to the stew-

---

\* *Life of Jesus Christ*, (American translation,) § 264.

ardship, *that* naturally fell to the lot of him, whose peculiar tastes and talents best fitted him for its management. Judas probably sought it, and it was assigned to him by general consent.\* If it proved a test, by which the fundamental selfishness of his nature was brought out, if by the abuse of its opportunities that fundamental selfishness fostered itself and grew strong, whose fault was that? Or wherein does the case of Judas differ in this particular, from that of other sinners under probation? Shall the sinner turn round, and say to the temptation under which he fell: "Thou art the sinner, and not I?" As well may the alloy charge upon the touchstone the baseness, which it simply detects and exposes.

Still, it is urged, *Jesus knew* what was in men (John 2: 24, 25,) and, from the beginning, who would betray him, (John 6: 64.) With this insight and prescience, how could He have made such a choice of a disciple,† or consented to such an appointment of treasurer? "Considered (says Strauss,) in the *economic* point of view: who trusts money with a man that he knows will steal it? Then, as an EDUCATOR: who places the morally weak in a place where just his weak side is so constantly solicited, that it may be *foreseen* he must sooner or later succumb to the temptation? No, indeed; never would Jesus thus trifle with souls committed to his care; never would he thus have manifested to them the very opposite of what he had taught them to pray: *Lead us not into temptation.*"‡ And so, Strauss infers that Jesus did not foresee the treachery of Judas, and that John lies when he says that He did. Others, accepting John's testimony on this point, have inferred the peccability of our Lord;§ while our authors, proceeding on the same assumption, think an apology for Judas necessary as a vindication of the sinlessness of Christ. A premise prolific of *such* conclusions, may well receive our scrutiny before we admit its soundness.

Now even assuming the absolute omniscience and perfect fore-knowledge of Jesus—which hardly any of these writers

---

\* Dr. Mack justly observes, that the idea of Judas' having been appointed treasurer by Jesus is a mere assumption, without the least historical proof. *Bericht über d. Herrn D. Strauss, Leb. Jes.*, p. 203.

† Schleiermacher (über d. Schrift. d. Luk., p. 88,) attempts to lessen the difficulty by showing that Jesus did not choose the disciples by a positive act of selection. But he is compelled to reject the testimony of Mark, (3: 13,) which is explicit.

‡ Leb. Jes., II., 385, § 114.

§ This cavil at our Lord is as old as the time of Celsus. Vid. Orig. contr. Cels., Lib. II., p. 71, (ed. Spencer.) Cf. Schollmeyer *Jes. u. Jud.*, p. 60.

would concede—we do not admit the justice of the representation. If Christ was omniscient, He was also omnipotent; and He would no more make use of the former attribute than of the latter, to interfere with those great *general principles* of the Divine administration, which equally guard, on the one side, the honor of the Supreme Arbiter, and, on the other, the moral freedom of His subjects. Under that administration, every man must pass his own probation; to every man, is guaranteed the privilege of showing, for himself, what morally he is—and each must bear the responsibility of this privilege. In the order of His earthly kingdom, here where the development of character is incomplete, the admission of members and the distribution of offices proceed necessarily on conditions which are but proximately determinative of the final result. The wheat and the tares grow together, and must grow together, till, time having fully matured both, the separation may be made with obvious justice, and consequently with entire safety to the honor and the interest of God's moral government.\*

And, to the human eye, how often does the probation of particular individuals appear mysteriously severe. How often, in the sovereign providence of God, are "the morally weak placed in these positions where just their weak side is most strongly solicited," and, as the event proves, beyond their power of resistance. How many are brought under the influences of the gospel, to whom it is destined to prove "a savor of death unto death," and received to the privileges of the Christian church only to be fitted the more surely and swiftly for destruction.† The Infinite Father sees it all, sees the end from the beginning, yet does not disturb the operation of His universal laws for their deliverance. But who doubts that in the end it will appear, that, with these as with all, He has dealt justly and kindly? Who taxes Him with want of love to those who are morally weak, because, notwithstanding their weakness and its sad results, He continues to govern by general, not by partial laws? Yet the argument is as good against the Father as against the Son.

But is it quite certain that Jesus possessed this absolute omniscience? Does He anywhere assert it? Does He not, in one instance (Mar. 13: 32) expressly disclaim it? The precise relation of the Divine to the human perfections of Christ, is an insolvable mystery; but is it not positively necessary to our conception of Him as "very man"—as

---

\*Mat. 13: 24-30.

†2 Cor. 2: 16; John 9: 39; Heb. 6: 4-8.



made like us, tempted as we are, and able to sympathize in all our infirmities, dangers and griefs—that He be considered *in some way* subject to the limitations of knowledge and power which are inseparable from our nature? This seems to be implied in His habitual expressions of dependence upon His Father: “The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself.” “As I hear, I judge.” “As my Father hath taught me, I speak.” “He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him.” In addition to His transcendent natural gifts, He received special and constant illuminations from above, adequate to all the vast (to human thought measureless) necessities of His Mediatorial office—and *no more*: because more than that would, in the same proportion, have unfitted Him for its perfect execution.

Jesus, then, *knew all men*: *i. e.*, He had a natural, and (so far as He needed) an inspired, insight into human character. *He needed not that any should testify of man*: He knew men better than they did each other—better than they knew themselves; and therefore no one could assist his judgment. *He knew what was in men*: He “looked quite through their deeds.” He clearly read the inward workings of the spirit by its outward manifestations. He knew, therefore, what was in Judas. In him, as well as others, He correctly interpreted the thousand spontaneous, often unsuspected indices of character, which reveal to the discerning eye, often through the most trivial words and actions, through mere looks, attitudes, and gestures, or perhaps even by silence and inaction, more of the depths of men’s souls than their own self-consciousness has yet fathomed. And so, *He knew from the first who would betray Him*—ἐξ ἀρχῆς, *i. e.*, not from all eternity, not from the creation of the world, not from the beginning of His human existence, or of His public ministry, or of Judas’s discipleship, but simply, as the context requires, from the beginning of the crime itself, and of that which led to it.\* From its very germ, in the prevailing bias of that selfish nature—in the love of money

---

\* Nothing can be clearer than that the phrases ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, κ.τ.λ., are to be understood, not absolutely, as referring to any definite point of time, but always (like our *at first*, *from the first*, &c.) *relatively* to the subject-matter. Without any difficulty, therefore, we refer them, in different connections, to *past eternity*, (2 Thess. 2: 13, John 1: 1, 2,) to *the creation of the world*, (Heb. 1: 10,) to *the creation of man and woman*, (Mat. 19: 4, 8,) to *Satan’s entrance into the world*, (John 8: 44, 1 John 3: 8,) to *the commencement of the gospel history*, (Luke 1: 2, John 15: 27,) to *that of the apostles’ ministry*, (Acts 11: 15, Phil. 4: 15,) to *the youth of Paul*, (Acts 26: 4,) &c. John, with whom these phrases are of frequent occurrence, sometimes uses them quite indefinitely, as nearly—*before, beforehand*: vid. c. 16: 4, and several times in his epistles.

especially, which is the root of all evil—he had traced the developments of that crime, the gradual estrangement of Judas's affections, the unfoldings of a restless, dissatisfied and traitorous spirit; and had too surely prognosticated the result. And yet there must remain, until the moment of its consummation, that *possibility of a change of purpose* which belongs to the very idea of a free agent. To that possibility, Jesus (supposing His foreknowledge not to have been absolute) would cling with the love that hopeth all things, till hope was no longer possible; and, in the earnestness of that love and hope, would continue to the last to press those heavenly truths, those purifying instructions, those special warnings against covetousness, and those significant intimations of His sad impending fate, which, if anything could, would have arrested Judas in his downward career and held him back from its dreadful termination. It is easy to say, Jesus should have dismissed him from a position of so much peril to his soul; but it would be very difficult to determine where he could have gone to find fewer temptations, or more powerful incentives to resist and aids to overcome them.

But after all, asks Strauss, (with an air of triumph,) as *a mere matter of feeling*, how could Jesus *bear* to have about him, through his whole public life, a man, of whom he was convinced that he would betray him, and on whom all his instructions were lost? How, indeed! The question has a significance more profound, probably, than he who put it was at all aware of. It is the mystery of the divine long-suffering and patience, repeated in the case of every sinner, who, like Judas, or (shall we say it?) like Strauss, has abused special advantages for improvement, and been, not benefited, but hardened by the means employed to save him. Not willing that any should perish, God bears long with such an one, heaps obstacles in his way to death; warns, teaches, expostulates, entreats, and strives by every means to win him to repentance. So Jesus waited long, and wept over the incorrigible. If, nevertheless, despising the riches of this long-suffering and forbearance, the sinner persists in treasuring up for himself wrath against the day of wrath; if "all this good proves ill in him, and works but malice," his frightful final doom must be charged, surely not upon the goodness which brought salvation within his reach, but upon the folly and sin which turned it to still greater damnation.

Considerations of this kind abundantly vindicate the

---

\* Leb. Jes., II., p. 386.

conduct of Jesus, in his relations to Judas, according to the common view. We resume, therefore, our attempt to reproduce, conjecturally, the whole psychological development of the betrayal. Conceding, within the limits mentioned, the sincerity of Judas in his original connection with Christ, we also see no reason to doubt that he became exceedingly *impatient* of his Lord's delay to seize upon his throne, and speculated much as to the cause of it. He could see reasons for His holding Himself aloof from the first outbursts of the popular favor, in order to test its permanence and give it time to mature and spread. But to persist in this dilatory policy, when everything to be gained by it had been gained, what was it but "to dull device by coldness and delay!" Again and again fortune smiled, and occasion invited to decisive action; but each favorable crisis had been suffered to pass away unimproved. No doubt these repeated disappointments had begun to vex and sour him. At length occurred the most propitious juncture of all. The fame of the Great Teacher and wonder-working Prophet had spread throughout the Jewish world. The multitudes gathered at Jerusalem from all parts of the land, and from foreign lands, to celebrate the Passover, were extensively imbued with those sentiments of respect and affection which His doctrine and His life had so generally inspired among the common people. They had already given him a triumphal entry into the city, and manifestly waited but a fair occasion to proclaim Him king. In whose ears rang those hosanna songs and shouts so musically, as in those of Judas? Whose heart swelled and leaped like his, with the conviction that the goal of a long-deferred hope was at last attained?\* It was but the prelude to another and more bitter disappointment. Instead of following up His advantage, instead of boldly seizing and subverting the feeble government of the Sanhedrim, Jesus contents himself with overturning the tables of some miserable money-changers and pigeon-mongers, and preaching a homily on the sanctity of God's house! Instead of either conciliating the rulers by well-timed concessions to their prejudices and their self-importance, or resolutely heading the populace against them, He first exasperates them by the rigor of His doctrines and the uncompromising severity of His rebukes, and then, at the approach of night, shrinks away into hiding-places, as though he felt his own weakness, and stood in awe of their power! We can well understand how all

---

\* Henneberg, *Komment. über d. Gesch. d. Leid. u. d. Tod. Jesu.*, p. 31.



this would fret and chafe poor Judas; how he would feel that he had a *right* to be angry with his Master, for thus neglecting His own interests, and those of His friends, who had risked and sacrificed so much for Him; and for wasting time in dreamy speculations of another life and exhortations to impracticable virtue, while He let one golden opportunity after another for securing *the substantial prize*, slip by him unimproved. It would begin to look to him less like the conduct of the promised Leader of Israel, than of an impotent and incapable enthusiast; and doubts would flash athwart his mind whether he had acted with discretion, in thus linking his fate with that of one who might turn out a mere fanatic, and taking sides with the Higher Law against the more tangible terrors of "the powers that were."

Thus, Demas-like, loving this present world more than the truth of God, he would find his faith staggering at every step because it rested not on the sure foundation, and his affection withering day by day because it had no root in itself. Under these circumstances, it accords well with the historical representation of Judas, as *a man of action*, to suppose that he had begun to meditate a plan to extricate himself from his embarrassed position; and with our conceptions of him as *a man of duplicity and cunning*, to expect that his plan will lack directness, and aim to guard against opposite contingencies. He will not openly revolt, because he can not be blind to the astounding evidences of Christ's divine power, the supreme qualifications for leadership which he had in so many ways exhibited, or the elements of certain success to His cause, if He should once begin to move in earnest. He dares not throw off the allegiance which may yet be worth all that he has ever rated it at; and yet, in the present crisis, he dares not steadfastly maintain it. It is easy to predict what he will do. He will adopt the usual expedient of truthless and sordid souls, in similar emergencies. He will *compromise*; he will play a double part; he will say, *Good Lord!* but he will say, *Good devil!* as well.

The rulers have resolved to bring Jesus to trial, but wish to arrest Him in absence of the multitude. They can not succeed, because by day the crowds surround Him, and He hides himself at night. But Judas knows where; and it will be no great sin, by merely pointing out the place of His retirement, to terminate this vexatious suspense, and *bring this matter to a decisive test*. If Jesus proves unequal to the emergency, very well; Judas is well out of the scrape. He will have the credit of bringing a dangerous impostor to justice; he will have discharged his duty to the laws and

religion of his country; he will have, in pocket, whatever the authorities may be willing to pay for the service, and a fair chance to engage in some more profitable speculation for the future. On the other hand, he assumes none of the responsibility of the arrest itself, and will take no part in any direct hostility. If (as still he must have hoped) Jesus is what he professes to be, He can easily protect Himself. He has the hearts of the people; He has unbounded resources; He has the power of miracles; He can at any moment, give the "sign from heaven" which is all that the rulers themselves demand, give such crowning demonstrations of His Messiahship as will unite all minds and all interests in His favor, and place Him at once upon the throne of His glory. Surely, there can be no *great* sin in this. Indeed, in view of all the happy results to be anticipated on either supposition, how easy to persuade himself that there was *no* sin in it at all; how easy to enlist *conscience* on the side of the treachery, and to go about it with a sort of half-persuasion that he was indeed performing "a great and glorious work." For when men undertake to serve two masters, they make strange work at casuistry. But who will venture to pronounce this plan "subjectively blameless?" Who, that perceives *self only* at the heart of it, and its "heart of heart," a wretched *love of lucre*?

We do not know how long such guilty speculations had been maturing in that dark and tortuous mind—perhaps for many months; nor when they took on the definite shape of a meditated treason; but they seem to have been determined suddenly at last, by our Lord's rebuke of his hypocritical murmurings at the supper in Bethany. It is difficult, indeed, to see, (as Schollmeyer and others have remarked,) what there was in that rebuke, considered by itself alone, so touching and tender in manner, however severe in effect, to kindle a feeling of anger in the bosom of Judas. But taking all the antecedents into account, nothing could be more natural. Such a decay of faith and love as we have supposed to be going on in the bosom of Judas; such waverings between the spirit of allegiance and revolt; such habitual secret musings on a *possible* severance of the existing tie between himself and his Master, could not fail to have produced an actual alienation of his heart from Jesus. As Neander well observes,\* when the proper manifestations of Christ had ceased to be attractive, (because no longer standing as the signs and guarantees to him of what his heart really coveted,) they would begin to grow *repulsive*; and more and more so

---

\* *Life of Christ*, p. 383.

every day: and more and more would his original attachment turn to a positive aversion. In this state of feeling, and with all the surrounding circumstances urging him to decisive action, the slightest offence from that quarter would be sure to arouse a most disproportionate resentment. We are not indeed, of those, who think that Judas could have possessed any great sensitiveness of nature, especially any very delicate *sense of honor*. Yet we have no doubt that, before he uttered his complaint of Mary, he had devised quite as satisfactory a justification of it as that which Schollmeyer propounds,\* (and Neander partially endorses,†) and that he felt it to be intolerably unjust, that he should be so peremptorily *shut up*, while entering so reasonable and pious a remonstrance against an enormous waste.

However that may be, *it is written* that "then" he did the deed. *Satan entered into him*, and found him ripe for diabolic uses—ready to entertain and to execute that "true devil's thought," as Paulus calls it, which before, he had looked at but askance. He went forthwith to the Sanhedrim and made the fatal bargain.

And here we meet the *second* great objection urged against the opinion, that avarice had anything to do with this treachery of Judas. *He only received thirty pieces of silver‡ for it*: "a paltry bribe," says Dr. Whateley,§ "far less than he might in a short time embezzle from the bag of which he was the keeper." But this reasoning overlooks the fact, that the undisturbed continuance of this latter opportunity was, just now, in special jeopardy. If his Master was going to be seized and put to death—as everything portended, and as He himself had just distinctly intimated—the pecuniary value of that "hole in the bag" would be decidedly depreciated in the mind of a ready reckoner like Judas. It overlooks, too, the future profits which he would naturally anticipate from the new service, of which this thirty pieces (for so slight a job) might be regarded as no unpromising bounty-money. Finally, it overlooks the various other motives, which might all act in concert with his ruling impulse because "all marshalling him the way that it would go;" and the ingenious devices, by which he would flatter himself that the tempting prize that lay within his reach, might be secured without endan-

\* Jes. u. Jud., p. 14.

† Life of Christ, p. 352.

‡ Equal, in silver, to about fifteen dollars, and, in value, to about twice that sum at the present day.

§ P. 313.



gering others in the distance. He might have *expected* more, but not being able to bring the council to his terms, have (in his heart) reasoned thus: "Thirty pieces is no great matter, to be sure—but considerably better than nothing, (or worse than nothing,) which is the possible, perhaps the probable alternative. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush; and as I get this without risking anything better, and accomplish several other desirable things at the same time, I should certainly be unwise to lose the opportunity." We think it was Whitfield, preaching one afternoon in Moorfields, who used something like the following illustration:—"See, yonder, the setting sun! He fills heaven and earth with his beams! Yet with this little dark hand, held thus close before my eyes, I can eclipse all his splendor and wrap myself in night. Just so, a single object of unlawful and inordinate desire, *however insignificant, however despicable*, will hide a universe of truth, a heaven of glory, from the soul!" That little pile of silver, so near to his hand, so close to his eye! who will undertake to estimate its power to darken and derange the mind of Judas?

He consummates his undertaking in a most characteristic manner. Striving to hide from his Master, striving (were it possible) to hide from himself, the part he was acting, he perpetrates the utmost act of perfidy with an accompanying expression of reverent affection, and by means of the most sacred symbol of a faithful love! He came to Jesus, and said, *Hail Master!* and *kissed* him.

Schollmeyer attempts to make of this a strong point in Judas's favor.

"It shows, that he was not ashamed of his act, that he regarded himself as performing, not evil, a deed of darkness, but good, a deed of the light. . . . If he had been conscious of intending ill to Jesus, if it had been his object to bring Jesus to destruction and, as the event proved, to the cross, would he have shown himself plainly and openly to his Master, as the person by whose assistance this cruelty had been effected? . . . He would rather have sought to dissemble; he would, after having concluded his bargain with the Sanhedrim, have remained with the other disciples near Jesus; he would have acted as though he knew nothing about all this," &c., &c. Pp. 30, 50.

Paulus even imagines, that he discovers a special anxiety in Judas to press himself into notice on this occasion, "And, by a kiss, to give to Christ and to all the intimation: '*I, I* it is, who have brought this fine project to this happy conclusion.' Thus, in advance, he is anxious not to be overlooked."\*

---

\* Exeg. Handb., III., 455.

It is difficult to treat such interpretation with respect. If Judas was so anxious to be known as the betrayer of our Lord, it is a pity he had not taken a somewhat earlier and less equivocal opportunity to claim the honor. His Master had certainly taken sufficient pains to open the way, so that modesty need not have prevented him. As it is, some might uncharitably suspect that Judas showed himself on that occasion, simply because it was impossible for him in any other way to fulfill his bargain with the enemies of Christ; and that the *Hail Master!* and the kiss, instead of being a frank and friendly announcement of himself as candidate for the honors due to fidelity, were an ingenious expedient to conceal the character, even while performing the act of a traitor. And this suspicion will not at all be weakened by the record, that "he that betrayed Him *had given them a sign*, saying Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast." Here, manifestly, we have the key to Judas's conduct. He will point out Jesus to the authorities, under circumstances favorable to his arrest—for that he has agreed to do—but he will do nothing more. He will join in no hostile demonstrations; he will not openly sunder the tie of discipleship; he will conduct the constables and soldiery where Jesus is, and will show them which is He; but it must be done by words and an act, expressive of the continuance of that relation, which yet may prove worth more to him than all besides. But Jesus exposes at once the vileness of the act and the thinness of the disguise: *Judas, betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?*—a question, which is utterly meaningless on the theory of Paulus.

Now rushes on the tragedy to its bitter end; and all things go counter to the vague hopes of Judas. No miracle in self-defence—no appeal to the popular favor—no effort to conciliate the judges and soften the fury of the persecutors—Judas sees his Master simply repeating His former claims to the honors of the Messiahship, simply referring to His former attestations as amply sufficient, then committing Himself to God that judgeth righteously, and preparing Himself for death—not as one whose resources are exhausted, but as one who means to make no further use of them—as one who, just freeing himself from any share of responsibility in the black crime of which he is about to become the subject, will leave *them* to bear it all who have dared to assume it. And O what a share in this responsibility is that of Judas! His startled mind glances backward for a justification, but in vain. The proofs of Christ's divinity stand thick and bright along the track of memory; and to

them is now added the exact fulfillment of His own predictions of the manner of His end. What right had Judas to prescribe a course for Him, and, because He did not pursue it, to put His life in jeopardy? What right had he to pursue a secret traffic with the enemies of Christ, while numbering himself among his friends? What could he lay to the charge of that Sinless One to justify the indignity and outrage to which He was subjected and which Judas had led on? How, above all, could he excuse to himself, or before Heaven, such a guilty abuse of the moral instruction he had received, such a base return for all the kindnesses and benefits with which his Lord had loaded him? He sees it all now—he sees his Master, and he sees himself—as in a focal blaze of truth. And alas! he sees that all this was obscure before, not for the want of light, but because the accursed love of gold had blinded him. Horror and remorse now seize upon his soul.

And here the apologists for Judas make another stand in his defence: *the depth of his repentance* evinces a better nature than he has had credit for, and is a proof that he was seeking not the destruction, but the exaltation of his Master. But it is obvious that in the so-called repentance of Judas, there was no touch of godly sorrow. It was not contrition, but remorse; and remorse is no sign whatever of a right spiritual state. It is simply that hell, the elements of which every sinner bears in his bosom; and which, once kindled, burns on forever, or until guilt is quenched in real penitence and pardon. The *degree* of remorse in the case of Judas—the terrific sharpness of those conscience-pangs, indicated in the retribution fierce and swift which his own hand inflicted—so far from proving, as De Quincey says, his comparative innocence, appear to us to show precisely the reverse. If excessive zeal for his Master were the sole occasion of his error, or if some such infirmity as may overtake good men betrayed him into it, why does he flee, as one accursed, to hide himself in a bloody and an infamous grave? If he were conscious through the whole of aiming at a worthy end and of a sincere devotion to his Lord, why does he not in his distress throw himself back upon this strong support? Why does not *he too* cry out: “O Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee!”

Still, it is urged, this remorse implies that Judas was looking for a different conclusion. If he had intended ill to Jesus from the beginning, asks Paulus, why should he have been surprised and disappointed at the result? “It is *failure* which opens men’s eyes to the error of their conduct, and reveals the



sinfulness which before had veiled itself under a thousand disguises."\* To which, we think, the answer of Strauss is pertinent and sufficient. "Not the failure alone, but the *success* of a crime as well, opens the eyes to its real character. Sin once become an act, throws off the mask it wore so easily, while existing only in thought; and stands ITSELF before us, in its own dark form. As little, therefore, as the sudden remorse of many a murderer, at the sight of his victim lying lifeless at his feet, proves that he never meant to strike a fatal blow; so little can we argue from the remorse of Judas that he had not before contemplated the natural consequences of his act."† The probability is, that Judas had, as far as possible, avoided contemplating any definite result to his Master; his mind was busy with calculating the various chances of luck for himself. The new and startling discovery which he now made, and which produced such a violent revulsion of feeling, was simply of the unspeakable turpitude and guiltiness of his act, and the utter worthlessness of the pretences under which he had willfully concealed the baseness of his real motives. Conscience at last wakes up from her enforced slumbers, and seizes her scorpion-lash. In vain he looks for the refuge of a single justifying plea. One desperate effort he makes to arrest the proceedings—flings from him the accursed stuff for which he had sold his soul, and loudly attests the innocence of his Master—and when that fails, stung through and through with remorse and crushed beneath an intolerable weight of despair, he rushes upon self-destruction and—goes to his own place.

Such is the view of Judas and his act, by which we would unite all the historical traces that have come down to us, consistently with the known principles of human nature. The part of it in which we feel the principal confidence, is that which rises directly out of the Scripture narrative, and is embraced in the so-called common view. It exhibits in him a sinner of no ordinary hue, but still very imperfectly conscious, as sinners always are, of the real magnitude of his sin until it was "finished, and had brought forth death"—an unhappy victim of the tempter, but first "drawn aside and enticed by his own lust" and entangled in the web of a willful and elaborate self-delusion. And as to his act, so widely do we differ from De Quincey in our estimate of it, that we can give no possible definition to the word *perfidy*, which would exclude it; we can conceive of no possible form of perfidy, which

---

\* Exeg. Handb., III., 456.

† Leb. Jes., p. 394.

would more justly be branded as *vulgar*; and its vulgarity we deem far from being its most odious feature.

The whole subject is not without its moral lessons, which it might be profitable to contemplate; but we have already transcended our limits, and these must be omitted or deferred.

---

#### ART. II.—THE REV. WILLIAM JAY.

*The Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay*; with Reminiscences of some distinguished contemporaries, selections from his Correspondence and Literary Remains. Edited by GEORGE REDFORD, D. D., LL. D., and JOHN ANGELL JAMES. 2 vols. 12mo. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1855.

*A Portraiture of the late Rev. William Jay*, of Bath: an outline of his mind, character, and pulpit eloquence, with notes of his conversations, and an estimate of his writings and usefulness. By the Rev. THOMAS WALLACE. 12mo, pp. 228. London: Hall, Virtue & Co. 1854.

SEVENTY years ago, the villages of England were very generally in a sad moral condition. The nation was being roused from a lethargic, not to say dead state, by the labors of Whitefield, Wesley, and their adherents, but darkness entrenched itself in the rural portions of the country, where "the parson" and "the squire" were seldom backward to oppose the preachers of Christianity who came "into their parishes," to labor. Whether in "holy orders, or *pretended* holy orders," they were almost sure to be opposed by noises, if not by hard pebbles and rotten eggs. Still there were men not a few who, in spite of opposition, were willing to labor, and did so labor as ultimately in a very happy degree to evangelize the country.

At Marlborough, in Wiltshire, there lived at that time an excellent Congregational minister, the Rev. Cornelius Winter, whose conversion by the ministry of George Whitefield, had been of a very striking character, who accompanied that remarkable man in his last voyage to this country, and returned after his death, to England, bearing back his will. Winter had much of Whitefield's energetic zeal, and extensively itinerated round the small market town in which he resided. Married, but without children, he had taken into his house

two or three pious young men, whom he prepared for the discharge of the Christian ministry. While thus engaged, he visited Tisbury, a village of some three hundred inhabitants, at a considerable distance from his residence, to preach in a small neat building erected by a retired mechanic for the preaching of the gospel. The wife of this gentleman was remarkable for her holy zeal, and was always found in the place as a kind of *sextoness*, ever ready to drop a word of instruction or comfort to those who attended on the preaching.

When Mr. Winter visited Tisbury in 1784, there was present a lad of fourteen, the son of a laboring stone-mason. Both father and son were working at the time, on the mansion then building in the neighborhood, by the distinguished Mr. Beckford, of whom our readers have probably heard, as expending some *seven millions of dollars* on the building and its furniture, including whatever he could find of rare and curious matters, from every quarter of the globe. This boy was poor, uneducated, and awkward in his manners; but his regular and early attendance on worship, and his deep attention to all its parts, arrested the attention both of Mr. Winter, and of Mrs. Turner, the lady to whom we have already referred. Winter desired an interview with this lad, and soon became satisfied, both as to his piety and his talents for the ministry; and we may add, fully as well satisfied that for the great work he needed preparation. Of this fact our readers shall have full evidence from a letter addressed by him to Mr. Winter, who had written to him, proposing that he should join the young men who were already residing in his house preparing for future duties. We copy it word for word, and letter for letter, from the *English* edition of Mr. Jay's Autobiography, because for some reason or other, the Episcopal grandsons of that distinguished minister have omitted it in the American reprint. It is, however, invaluable, as showing our young men how a man may rise to eminence who begins low, and proves that a youth who has been brought up in ignorance, but who desires to prepare himself for usefulness, may succeed if he is industrious. Who can despair, when he finds that the following extraordinary document proceeded from the pen of the celebrated Jay?

"TISBURY, January 30th, 1785.

"To Mr. Winter, Marlborough.

"DUTIFUL FREIND,—this comes with my kind love to you hoping It will you in good health as it Left me and all my friend at tisbury thanks be to god for his mercy and Goodness in preserving us to this present moment in health and strength, health is the hony that Sweetens every temporal mercy to be well in body is a great blessing but to be well in Soul is a much greater Blessing than this what is the body when compared with the Soul it is no more than



the Candles Slender Light to the great illuminary the Sun in its meridian Splendor and beauty.

"I received your Letter and was very thankfull for your kindness to me in it. You Desired to hear from me by Mr. Serman's return and if I could write you something of my Christen Experience. my experience is that I Desire to Love the Lord above all and Desire to Live more to his Glory and honour. I hope I can say that he is the Chiefest to my soul of ten thousand and altogether Lovly I desire to know nothing but Jesus and Desire to be found in him not having on my own Righteousness which is polluted with sin and impure but the Righteousness which is of god which is for all and upon all that Believe in him. my father says he will find me in cloths as much as he is able I can come at any time when you think proper. So I conclude with my father and mother's Love to you I am your humble servant

WILLIAM JAY."

We are now quite prepared to believe Mr. Jay when he says, "It will naturally be supposed that no man could have gone to an academy more destitute of many advantages than myself. But I had a thirst for knowledge, and a valuation of it, which would ensure *application* when opportunities and means were afforded. Mr. Winter's library was not large, but it was large to me; and every moment I could spare from my studies, I was searching it as for hidden treasure. It may seem strange, but the authors I was most struck with then, have continued to be my favorites ever since, and my views and taste with regard to sermons and preachers have no otherwise changed than as they have been enlarged and improved."

To anything like eminence in learning, Mr. Jay never reached. His attainments in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, were respectable, but nothing more. He acquired a good knowledge of French, for the sake of becoming acquainted with Saurin, Massillon, and the other preachers of eminence in that language. As a reader, he was *voracious*. Scarcely any book or pamphlet published, whether secular or religious, escaped his notice, and everything was made to tell upon the pulpit. His judgment was usually sound, his memory tenacious, and authors whom it would be dangerous for some young men to read, were to him exceedingly useful. This was the fact throughout life.

At the period to which we have referred, as that of the youth of Mr. Jay, the ministry of England presented itself in a very remarkable aspect. The well-educated part of the clergy, in the established church and out of it, were comparatively few, and too many of these were sadly too *genteel* for the masses; scarcely any dissenting colleges existed; for indeed, the law which prevented Dissenters from teaching academies, had but a few years before been repealed; those who had been encouraged by Whitefield and Wesley, to

enter on the sacred office, were generally eminently pious, strong-minded men, but uneducated, and some of them coarse. Men of piety in the church and out of it, united with the Countess of Huntingdon, in preparing young men, in some degree at least, for the pulpit. Besides the college which was founded by her ladyship at Trevecca, in South Wales, Winter, of Marlborough, Doddridge at Northampton, Bull, of Newport Pagnell, and others, were assisted by the Thorntons, Hills, and others, who liberally contributed to this holy cause, for which multitudes will eternally bless God. The system of education was strictly domestic. The young men resided in the house of their tutor, gave their mornings to their grammars and their books, which, with the conversations of their teacher, formed substantially the training they received; in the afternoon and evening, often in his company, they visited the sick beds, and where they were allowed, the prisoners, and in the evenings, as well as on the Lord's days, preached in the villages. They were generally opposed, but God protected them, and many were soon found to guard them from harm.

At about sixteen, it was determined that William Jay should not go to the University and enter the church. Sir Richard Hill and John Thornton, the philanthropist, decided against it, saying, "God has opened the young man's mouth, and for years to come we dare not shut it, while there are so many immediate and pressing calls for exertion." He began, therefore, young and immature as he was, to preach; he visited London, and officiated several times to the thousands of Rowland Hill's congregation. He says: "This indeed was a formidable engagement, but I was carried through it far beyond my expectations. The place, though so large, was soon crowded to excess; and when I preached my last sermon, the yard before the dwelling-house was filled with the lingering multitude, who would not disperse till I had bidden them farewell from the window."

This visit to the metropolis was an important event in the life of the young preacher. It introduced him to an acquaintance and friendship with the excellent John Newton, and John Ryland the senior; laid the foundation of an annual six weeks' visit to London, for a very long succession of years; and first brought him into company with the lady who became his first excellent wife, and the mother of his children.

On his return to the country, very wisely refusing calls given him to settle in London, he preached successively to two small churches in the neighborhood of Mr. Winter's residence, where his salary was considerably less than two

hundred dollars per annum. By a series of remarkable events, the hand of God led him to the fashionable city of Bath, where he entered on his ministry in a large and new meeting-house; here he spent more than sixty years in the pastorate of the same church, whose edifice during that period was twice enlarged. Let us hear his own description of his life and happiness.

"Should I be willing, such as I have found it, to go over life again? I have heard many express the sentiment, though not in the poetry of Cowper:

' Worlds should not bribe me back to tread  
Again life's dreary waste,  
To see the future overspread  
With all the gloomy past.'

But such language is not for me. I should not shrink from the proposal of repetition. 'Goodness and mercy have followed me all the days of my life.' My duties have not been burdening and irksome. My trials have been few compared with my comforts. My pleasures have been cheap and simple, and therefore very numerous. I have enjoyed, unsatiatingly, the seasons and the sceneries of nature. I have relished the bounties of Providence, using them with moderation and thankfulness. I have delighted in the means of grace; unutterable have been my delights in studying and perusing the Scripture. How have I verified the words of Young,

'Retire and read thy Bible to be gay!'

Preaching has been the element of my heart and my head. My labors have met with much acceptance, nor have I labored in vain. I have seldom been without hearing of some instances of usefulness from the pulpit or the press. God has honored me, to call by my labors, not a few individuals, even into the ministry. The seat of my residence, was of all others, the place of my preference. My condition has been the happy medium of neither poverty nor riches. I had a most convenient habitation and lovely garden, a constant source of attraction, exercise, and improvement. I had a sufficient collection of books of all kinds. My wife was a gentlewoman, a saint, and a domestic goddess. My children were fair, and healthy, and dutiful. My friends were many, and cordial and steady. Where shall I end?

'Call not earth a barren spot,  
Pass it not unheeded by;  
'Tis to man a lovely spot,  
Though a lovelier waits on high.'

I do not believe that in this earth, misery preponderates over good. I have a better opinion of mankind than I had when I began my public life. I can not therefore ask what is the cause that the former days were better than these? I do not believe in the fact itself. God has not been throwing away duration upon the human race. The state of the world *has* been improving, and *is* improving. Who justifies slavery now? What noble efforts have been made to break every yoke, and to make the oppressed go free! How is the tendency to war, on every slight pretence, giving way to reference and negotiation! How delightful is it to think of what is doing abroad among the heathen; and the exertions that are put forth by all denominations of Christians to make the Saviour's way known upon earth, and his saving health among all nations!" *Autobiography*, vol. i., pp. 179, 180.



In his social intercourse, Mr. Jay was an exceeding pleasant and instructive companion. He had nothing of the rapidity and brilliance of Hall and Coleridge of the past, or of Raffles and Harris of the present day, but he was solid, communicative, and free from hauteur. He utterly disliked controversy, or severe remarks on any denomination of professing Christians who "held the head," and would immediately frown down any such attempt. Hence, his company was highly valued, and by the best Christians, valued most, both for its savor of piety, and the prayers with which he would usually close his interviews with his friends.

Few men could give a more ingenious answer to a difficult question than Mr. Jay. Many years ago, there resided in London, a preacher named Huntington, a man of powerful mind, of violent spirit, and coarse manners. He was a strong antinomian, and attracted a large congregation, drawn together, partly at least, to hear his pulpit abuse of all other ministers. A warm adherent of this man once obtained access to Mr. Jay, during one of his visits to the metropolis, and sought his opinion of the arch heretic; Mr. Jay declined saying anything about him, but the man would not take "no" for an answer; at length Mr. Jay said in his own deep, sonorous tone, and in a grave, deliberate manner, as though perfectly conscious that whatever he said would be carried to Huntington, and if possible perverted in the pulpit: "Sir, I remember reading in a very old book, 'The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance;' now, sir, if Mr. Huntington has these fruits, he is a very good man."

Our readers will very naturally expect that we shall say something as to Mr. Jay's public life. As a *pastor*, then, we do speak of him as a model. He himself knew that throughout his whole course as a minister, he was found fault with on this matter. We will transcribe a somewhat long passage on this topic, partly that he may be heard in his own defence, and partly that the members of our churches may have some hints which possibly may tend to their improvement.

"I can truly say, it affords me no satisfaction to find similar complaints very prevalent wherever I have gone. Nor do I in this case, wish to attempt *wholly* to justify myself—far from it. I might have done more, especially in *some* cases, than I have done, by more decision, arrangement, and diligence. Who can look back on any department of duty and usefulness, and not have reason to exclaim, 'If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?' Yet I would remark a few things, by way, at least, of explanation, rather than of excuse.

"No little of this censured neglect was *voluntary* with me, and therefore it did not aggrieve my mind. I saw that much of what was commonly expected

was unreasonable, and that it was consequence rather than improvement that was affected by disappointment.

"I saw several kinds of visitants whom I did not see I was called to follow.

"*First.* The smokers, furnished with a pretty pipe, and its usual concomitants, at every house of call.

"*Secondly.* The listless and self-indulgent, who found that diligent study was much less inviting than lounging from one company to another, and hearing the news of the neighborhood.

"*Thirdly.* The truly pious who are really concerned to do good, but were often less useful than they meant or imagined. Many of these have not the oily slang of religious phrases; they are not apt at free and appropriate address, or turning all incidents to profitable account; yet they might preach to advantage, had they time and leisure for reading and meditation.

"I saw also that their calls were not always acceptable or convenient. This was the case with mechanics and men in business, and still more so with females in ordinary life, who were ordinarily taken up with their domestic cares.

"I saw also that the whole congregation must be visited, in which case, if it were a large one, the whole of a preacher's time would be occupied, or the minister would be deemed a respecter of persons, giving as much pain as pleasure; flattering the pride of one, and gendering the envy of another, by supposed partiality.

"I also could not but see how little profit resulted from more set visits, of longer continuance, and including table and tea entertainments. In these meetings how nearly impossible is it to commence or maintain discourse by which you can either gain or do good!

"I am aware that there must be interviews and intercourses, when they are of no particular character or utility; they contribute to good neighborhood and social pleasure; but I am now speaking of things in reference to their ecclesiastical relation, and the importance of their bearing on ministerial duty and excellence.

"If familiarity does not breed contempt, it reduces reverence: and too much intimacy has often lowered the impression and influence of many a minister; for there are but few who have the same presence and address in the parlor as in the pulpit.

"I have no opinion of a pastor that is not very studious. But study demands leisure and retirement, and 'through desire a man, having separated himself, seeketh and intermeddleth with all wisdom.' He should, therefore, as much as possible, avoid publicity, and be covetous and niggardly of every fragment of time. A man who has some degree of talent, especially an easiness and fluency of speech, may do for an itinerant or occasional preacher, by his brisk superficialities; but let him become stationary, and have to preach three or four times a week to the same people, and he will soon abound with sameness, and become sapless and unedifying; the young will feel little attraction; the intelligent will be tempted to withdraw; the dull will become drowsy; and the ignorant that remain will be ignorant still.

"People for their own sakes should do all they can to promote a habit of mental application in their ministers, and be concerned to allow them every opportunity within their reach for exerting it, especially their mornings and evenings. Of course, if they love their pastors, they will feel pleasure in their company, nor will that company be unreasonably refused; but let them as much as possible choose the time of intercourse, and not accuse them of indolence, or self-indulgence, if it be not as frequent as they could wish. Perhaps at the very moment of their hearers' complaint, they are in their retirement praying for them, or studying to comfort or profit them, if not with the sweat of the brow, with the sweat of the brain; 'for much study is a weariness of the flesh.'

"I therefore never felt anything like self-reproach when conscious of my being fully employed ; and persuaded that I was better subserving, not only my own welfare, but that of my people and of the public, in my study, than in gadding about without an aim in idle interviews and nursery talk.

"I mention not this, therefore to make those easy who rise not before seven in the morning ; hang loose from strenuous improvement all the day ; are drawn aside by every trifling excitement ; and apply the time they affect to husband *from* visiting to no equal purpose, or no purpose at all ; but for the sake of upright and conscientious men, who are anxious to make full proof of their ministry, but grieve because they can not do the things that they would.

"But is not a minister a pastor, and is not a shepherd to mind and manage the state of all his sheep ? He is, and he must peculiarly regard cases of urgency and distress ; he is to bind up that which is broken ; to bring back that which has wandered ; but he can only feed and lead, and fold the flock *together, or collectively.*

"Cases of affliction have special claims on pastoral attention ; and in these consolation or spiritual profit may be administered by a word in season. But here ministers have sometimes been blamed for remissness, when they have not been made acquainted with the distress. The rule is, 'Is any sick among you, let him *call* for the elders of the church ;' thus at once informing them of his case, and expressing his desire to be visited.

"I observe also, that much in this supposed delinquency was with me *unavoidable.* I began my course under many early disadvantages ; for I began young, and nearly from the beginning was thrown into situations and circumstances which had many and exciting demands upon me, without assistance. Though physically incapable of enduring so much confinement and engagement as some of my brethren, I had four sermons per week at home, besides frequent calls abroad.

"Bath, the place of my residence, exposed me to many interruptions ; and my own people little knew how much I was *necessarily* engaged in visiting strangers who came there for health, and were away from their usual pious helps. I might also mention, that I was early unintentionally led to become an author ; and God giving me much acceptance, I regarded the press as well as the pulpit, the one indeed as to extensiveness and continuance, superior to the other. This also required time and attention, and much more than justice to my subject demanded.

"As congregations grew larger and more respectable ; as more preparation for the pulpit was needful than formerly ; as institutions have so much multiplied, and pastors must often be engaged in services added to their home routine of duty ; new and serious difficulties arise in the present discharge of the ministerial function. How are they to be met ? It seems now hardly possible to combine equally in the same man the excellencies of the pastor and the eminence of the preacher. I have seldom seen an instance of both. Dr. Mason, of New York, in his farewell address to his church, says, 'If you would have us not only to preach Christ publicly, but from house to house, you must put your hands into your pockets, and support a dozen more pastors.' " *Autobiography*, vol. i., pp. 171-175.

In the quotation we have just made, Mr. Jay speaks of himself as an *author*, and we should be happy, if our limits would allow of it, to devote a page or two to this subject. So much the more freely should we do this, because he himself felt strong pleasure in the fact that his works in this country have been so extensively circulated ; indeed, to a greater extent than in



Great Britain. It is somewhat singular that his grandsons in this country have been very anxious to guard the public against publications of his sermons, *etc.*, which he did not authorize, and which they have not prepared for the press. But let it be known to them, as well as to others, that Mr. Jay himself never opposed the publication of his sermons when properly taken down by short-hand writers, who could very well accomplish this task from his very distinct and slow delivery. Nay, he himself, when he published his sermons, made much use of the notes of his friends; for it was very seldom of late years a sermon was written before its delivery. Criticisms on his works are entirely unnecessary where they are so well known as they are by our readers, nor will our limits allow us to pursue the subject.

The latter fact must also account for our omission of the circumstances of his later years; such as the loss of his excellent wife,—his marriage of an excellent and wealthy Baptist lady,—his ecclesiastical trials,—the unhappy division of his church on the matter of electing his successor,—at the head of which secession he unwisely as we think placed himself: these things, together with his last illness and death, are detailed in the volumes, and to them we must refer as giving on these and other matters much instructive and interesting detail. His decease occurred Dec. 27, 1853, at the age of eighty-four years.

Our principal object when we began this article, was to present a view of Mr. Jay chiefly as THE PREACHER. And when it is remembered that scarcely any other man of his day preached to more persons, that he was almost equally admired by Wilberforce the eminent statesman, by Hannah More the most useful female writer of her day, by the clergy of every church, and by the vast masses of the poor, such a view can not be unimportant. Besides, the fact that he was no less than five times, within his sixty years' active ministry, prevailed on to preach the annual sermon for the London Missionary Society, a fact unparalleled in the history of such an institution,—that every other evangelical Missionary body in England, except the Episcopalians, sought similar services and enjoyed them at his hands, and that with the exception of the late Dr. Collyer, he was the only *dissenting* minister called to preach before royalty, renders the desire to know wherein the secret of his power lay, more intense. It was our happiness to become personally acquainted with him in 1819, at the house of an excellent lady, Mrs. Ulph,—of whose conversion and character he gives an interesting account. We then spent the larger portion of ten days with him,

attending the morning and evening services he so simply and beautifully describes in his autobiography. From that period for many years afterwards, our intercourse was frequently renewed, and we listened to his pulpit *deliverances* as Chalmers would call them, with ever increasing interest. Our sketch must be short, but it shall be faithful.

*His person was attractive.* This is, in the present day, a matter of no small importance; for even Christians would reluctantly hear Paul, with his diminutive person, hesitating speech, and nervous trembling, if a more handsome person, with a fine voice, and who was reputed "a good speaker," was present. Mr. Jay was somewhat below the average height, and in his latter years inclined to corpulency; his head was rather large, but well formed, and covered with a mass of hair, which for the last thirty-five years was grey almost to whiteness. His eyes, when he had begun to speak, were brilliant and piercing; and his voice was capable of every imaginable tone, and was always under the most complete management. His complexion was florid, and his features presented intelligence and benevolence, combined with somewhat of arch humor. In a word, the God of nature formed him for an orator. Dr. James Hamilton beautifully describes him in the declining years of his life. "It is not very long since we heard him with wonder and delight, and in our own as well as millions of memories is still depicted that countenance whose sunshine furnished its own photograph; so wise and so witty, so wrinkled, yet so radiant; with so much of youthful ardor welling up in the fountains of those deeply fringed, softly burning eyes; and with words so holy and so tender dropping from those lips in whose corners lurked all that was quaint or caustic; whilst like an oak-thicket on an old rampart-summit, that strong visage and firm brow rose and were lost in the shaggy wilderness which covered all with its copsy crown."

*His manner was natural.* He never affected anything, or played a trick of oratory in opposition to nature. When he once read for his text, "Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting," and turned his back on his audience to write with his finger on the wall the characters of "*Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*," and then turning from the wall, said, "The object of our introduction is to secure attention, and having now done that, I proceed," etc., no one smiled, because it seemed nature itself. He had little action, but what he had, was so appropriate, that you at once forgot the action in the words connected with it. Brinsley Sheridan, certainly no mean judge, said that Jay was the most perfectly

natural orator he had ever heard. And because he was natural, and therefore simple, his hearers gave themselves up entirely to his control, so that he could command their smiles and their tears, whenever he chose to do it, almost in the same breath.

*His preaching was original.* He imitated no one. He read much, but made all entirely his own before he delivered it, and then delivered it entirely in his own way. He once told us, that his plan was to grind down the "old divines," such as the Puritans and Nonconformists of the seventeenth century, to modern taste; but so entirely had he effected the change, that Bates or Howe, Bunyan or Flavel, had they heard him, would scarcely have recognized themselves. He carefully studied mankind, and was well acquainted with his own heart, and preached in accordance with this knowledge.

*Hence he was abundant in illustrations.* No one ever heard him, and came away with the complaint that he could not be understood. And all his illustrations were drawn from well-known objects. His hearers might almost suppose that he had witnessed their conduct and heard their conversation in their families, during the preceding week, so fully would he describe all, and so forcibly would he tell them how they felt and acted, and what they were bound to do. We once heard him so draw a comparison between the indolent Christian, and the servant who would be in difficulties all the day long as the result of late rising, as to lead several ladies to remark as they left the house, that if Mr. Jay had been residing in their families for the last week he could not have more exactly described the facts of the case. This was, no doubt, a great part of the secret of his acceptance with the masses of the people. Whatever he said they seemed entirely to understand, and yet, they could not tell why they had never thought of it before. If to secure popularity, it is necessary to *interest* the people, it is certain that our preacher could never fail.

We never knew a man who could make every fact *tell* as he could in his ministry. We remember thirty-five years ago, hearing him preach at a considerable distance from his home, and urging upon sinners their folly in refusing to come to Christ. During a very forcible appeal on this subject, he said, "There lived some years ago, in my city of Bath, a very eminent physician, who would often be called in to see, perhaps a sick lady; he would listen to her statement, ascertain the state of her pulse, and then prescribe suitable medicine, and a proper diet. He would not unfrequently be met with the inquiry, 'But, doctor, may I not eat this, or drink



that?" And the good old man would put a stop to the whole by taking up his hat and cane, and leaving the house, with saying, 'Good morning, madam, you are not bad enough for me yet.' And so multitudes of sinners refuse to submit to the plain, direct, self-denying terms of the gospel; they must first feel their condition as utterly and forever hopeless without Christ, and then they will be willing to be saved by implicit submission to his terms."

*His spirit was always devotional.* Here is his own statement in reference to one occasion, and we have reason to know that he only described his common habit: "When I had to preach before the Duke of Sussex, at the opening [dedication] of Hanover Chapel, [Rev. Dr. Collyer's,] instead of dining with his Royal Highness and a large company previously to the service, I passed the time in retirement, and when I left it to enter the pulpit, I felt no more than if I had been going to preach Christ in a poor-house. One of the papers of the day abused me, for the freedom of my address, but as I had never been accustomed to speak evil of dignities, so I was not likely to insult greatness to its face. The case was, retirement had awakened conscience, and conscience accompanied me in the pulpit, and bade me speak, 'not as pleasing men but God who searcheth the heart,' and with whom 'there is no respect of persons.'"—*Autobiography*, vol. i., p. 126.

The editors of the *Autobiography* have so well described Mr. Jay as conducting public worship that we shall make no apology for the extract:

"He entered the pulpit in a grave, collected manner, apparently absorbed in his mission, and with a step rather quick, yet solemn, and without hurry; and after sometimes casting a glance round upon the audience, retired into himself, and seemed to be gathering up his thoughts and energies to negotiate between God and man the weighty affairs of judgment and of mercy.

"In the preliminary exercises of public worship, reading the Scriptures and prayer, Mr. Jay never forgot that, in one of these he was enunciating the words of the Most High; and that in the other, he was addressing himself to Him before whom the seraphim veil their faces. It has been sometimes thought and said that very little spiritual, at any rate saving effect, is produced by the public reading of the Scriptures. Is not this to be traced up to the careless, unimpressive, irreverent, and unfeeling manner in which the exercise is performed? The tones, emphasis, and accents of a good reader, who is neither elaborate, artificial, nor theatrical in his manner, convey both instruction and impression, and are a kind of exposition of the sacred text. In prayer Mr. Jay was often singularly felicitous in his expressions, and always devout in his manner; his devotions were richly scriptural and strictly appropriate; perhaps occasionally a little too quaint in expression, and therefore liable to interfere with perfect composure and gravity. He was slow and solemn, and his feelings under control." Vol. ii., pp. 290, 291.

It must not be supposed that Mr. Jay, with all his excel-

lencies, was *perfect*, even as a preacher. His language in the pulpit, especially in his later years, frequently lacked *dignity*. While he never forgot the masses, he was sometimes forgetful of those of his hearers who needed higher thoughts, and a better style of expression. His selection of texts was not always in good taste. Who but he would have selected for sermons at the dedication of houses of worship such texts as, "Is there any taste in the white of an egg?" "I am fearfully and wonderfully made." "There be three things which go well, yea, four are comely in going; a lion, which is strongest among beasts, and turneth not away for any. A greyhound, a he-goat also; and a king, against whom there is no rising up." In writing to Lady Ducie on a Saturday, he says, "From one of these five [texts] D. V. I hope to preach to-morrow morning: "Take it by the tail."—"It was always so."—"Amen, the Lord God say so too."—"In that day a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep."—"The people that know their God shall be strong, and do exploits." As Mr. Wallace very properly says, "It was, on his part, eccentric. We viewed it as being fantastic, unseemly, *objectionable*—and it would certainly be a bad example for young ministers at all to imitate. Plain, broad, rich, evangelical texts are the best." We might, also, complain of too much sarcasm, too frequent sallies of wit and humor, and other things which must of necessity offend good taste, but we forbear; except to remark, that though he claimed excellence for himself as preaching *short* sermons, some of his constant hearers complained that he often went beyond the hour, sometimes far towards two.

One fault more, however, we must notice, because it was his greatest, and in our judgment, was followed by evil results. His sermons were not, taken as a whole, sufficiently *doctrinal*. The editors of his "*Autobiography*" say, "We think Mr. Jay was a little deficient in not giving greater room and prominence to the chief truths of salvation in their dogmatic form. He acknowledged he was so in early life, and it was perhaps also true to the end of it." Mr. Wallace says, too:

"Mr. Jay, as a preacher, was not commonly very doctrinal. You certainly had a very clear, consistent, beautiful exhibition of the doctrines of grace furnished by his valuable ministry; still he was not what we should term, by any means, a *doctrinal* preacher. He was more experimental, practical and hortatory in the uniform style of his ministry, than doctrinal. He was very *evangelical*; his sermons abounded in great principles; still he rarely preached a series of discourses on the leading doctrines of Christianity which we deem so instructive and so important—of value inestimable—in days like these, especially for the younger and less experienced members of

our congregations. It was often remarked to us, by intelligent and matured Christians, that if Mr. Jay's ministry had abounded more in the development and illustration of the great doctrines of the Gospel, presenting them distinctively yet *consecutively* before the mind, it would have been more beautiful and more effective. Its richness, fulness, and power, would beyond question have been much augmented." Pp. 91, 92.

It can only, we think, on the principles just stated, be accounted for, that notwithstanding the numbers, wealth, and general intelligence of the congregation at Argyle Chapel, with their cordial appreciation of Mr. Jay's ministry, no one could scarcely fail to observe their too general unacquaintance with the leading peculiarities of Christianity; on this principle, too, we account for the very small efforts they made for the diffusion of the gospel, and for the fact that no attempt was made during the whole of his active ministry to colonize for the organization of a new church, though Bath must have increased at least threefold in its population during that time. Strong doctrinal principle alone will sustain ardent and active zeal.

Perhaps we ought before this to have given our opinion of the volumes before us. They are valuable, very valuable, nor would we for a considerable sum have been without them; but still we are somewhat disappointed; they are not what we had a right to expect. Mr. Jay's own portions of them will disappoint his friends, who had been expecting for thirty years past, according to his frequent promises, his best thoughts on the best men of his age, and all the most important facts of his own life. After what he had engaged to give us, he ought not to have delayed making even a commencement till he had far passed his threescore and ten years, and when of necessity mind and memory were on the wane. We have looked in vain for beautiful little touches of facts in his early and middle life which we have heard from his lips; dates, the most important helps to history, are scarcely ever given, and are not fully supplied by the editors. These gentlemen were somewhat bound down by the peculiar character of their materials, and we fear also, that they did not separately feel as they should have done, their responsibility. Certainly either of them alone could have produced a better book. Dr. Redford's "*Memoirs and Select Remains of the Rev. John Cooke*," though published nearly thirty years ago, is a work far superior to the present, and Mr. James's capabilities our readers all know.



**ART. 3.—CLASSICAL STUDIES IN THIS COUNTRY.**

GEORGE VON RAUMER, professor of history and political economy in the University of Berlin, has expressed the opinion, in his interesting work on the United States of America,\* that the ancient classics have a more decided influence in this country than in Germany. We happened a few years ago to be present at a meeting of the Archæological Society of Berlin, when a paper was read by one of the members combating the opinion expressed by Raumer, and speaking in no very complimentary terms of the condition of classical learning in America. After the paper was read, the presiding officer turning to us, very politely asked our opinion on the subject. Our situation was somewhat embarrassing. That we, who, like so many others, had repaired to Germany for advantages in the prosecution of classical study which could not be found here, should be asked in the presence of so many distinguished scholars, whether we thought classical learning exerted more influence in the United States than in Germany, was certainly not a little incongruous.

But the opinion of Raumer, paradoxical as it may seem, is not without some appearance of plausibility. In support of it he refers to the fact that the founders of our government had continually before their minds the republics of Greece and Rome, not indeed as models for servile imitation, but as furnishing outlines more perfect than any other governments, ancient or modern; and that the brilliant achievements of the ancient republics in contending for their liberties, as well as the individual instances of heroic character which they furnish, are made more familiar here to the mass of the people than in any other country. The fact can not, we think, be denied that the genius of our institutions, and the spirit of our people, far more than of any other living nation, strikingly resemble those of Greece and Rome, and to attribute this fact in part, at least, to the influence which the literature of the ancient republics has exerted upon us, is not unnatural. We are not surprised that an intelligent and well educated German, on first coming among us, and becoming familiar

---

\* Die vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika. (2 Bde. Lpz. 1845.)

with the spirit of our people, should have been struck with the fact, and should have interpreted it as Raumer has done.

This, however, is but one view of the case; and though it may be the one first presented, it is not likely to be taken on a closer examination. There are many other things which go to make up the character of a people besides political organization and national spirit; and to the scholar who is familiar with the state of learning among us, comparing it with the attainments of German scholarship, it would be difficult to make the view of Raumer seem in any degree plausible.

But we do not now intend to discuss at length the merits of Raumer's opinion; nor is it at all our object to show the importance of classical learning as an essential part of a liberal education. Arguments and appeals to this end have by no means been wanting in this country; and not a few men of eminence take every suitable occasion for the expression of the most enlightened opinions on this subject. Nor do we need for the sake of those who will be likely to read our remarks, to present any arguments or facts tending to set forth the low and discouraging condition of classical learning among us. This surely would be lost labor; for it must be apparent to all who have any knowledge whatever of the subject, that in philology we have done far less than in science and general literature. We propose rather to discuss some of the causes which contribute to produce the present state of things, hoping that those who wish for any improvement may thus be led to consider the best means for effecting it.

Among the foremost of these causes, we should undoubtedly mention our imperfect facilities for the prosecution of classical study. In all countries the facilities for acquiring a ready and familiar acquaintance with the ancient, must be inferior to those for the acquisition of the modern and living languages. There is no place in existence where one can enjoy such advantages for the study of Latin, as are accessible almost anywhere, for the study of French or German. But the general facilities for the study of Latin and Greek among us, fall as much below those of England and some portions of the European continent, as in those countries, the means for acquiring a ready knowledge of the ancient languages are inferior to those for the acquisition of the modern. Under the head of facilities, we allude more especially to text-books and teachers. It is a well-known fact that our country is still flooded with text-books which are not only extremely imperfect, but which abound in errors. The best instructors everywhere reject and discountenance

them, but this does not suffice to drive them from even the greater number of our schools. To say nothing of the commentaries on classical authors in which the most erroneous statements and the most absurd principles of interpretation are admitted, the elementary works, particularly the Greek grammars which are placed in the hands of beginners, are often of such a character, that exact scholarship is rendered impossible. The general paradigm of the verb as it stands in most of the older Greek grammars, and in many which are still in use, would, we imagine, look as strange to Xenophon as it ever did to any one of us: nor would he be any better able to give all of the parts than the dullest boy in any of our schools. The verb signifying *to be*, fares still worse than the general paradigm. The learner, in his reading, meets continually with forms which he can not find in his grammar, and he commits to memory from his grammar, forms which he surely never will meet with in his reading. It would seem that the man who takes it upon him to prepare a Greek grammar, ought to know the third person, singular number, imperfect tense, of the verb signifying *to be*, a form continually occurring in every Greek author; and yet there are grammars in very general use among us, which do not give even that form as it actually exists. It would be easy to multiply illustrations on this point in respect to grammars, as well as to dwell upon the imperfections of many other critical helps which are in common use; but the imperfection of text-books, is not the greatest evil in our schools. There is something else which lies at the foundation of this evil, and perpetuates it. Were our classical schools supplied with competent instructors, we should not long have occasion to complain of the use of such grammars and commentaries as we now meet with. It would be a very low qualification to require of every instructor, that he should be able himself to correct errors in paradigms; it would scarcely be too much to require of the principal instructor in every classical school, that he should be competent to write a respectable grammar by the aid of such helps as could be easily obtained. But if this test of qualification were in all cases applied, how many of the classical schools throughout our country do we imagine would be supplied with instructors? So far from coming up to this requisition, the great majority of those who undertake to prepare boys for college, can scarcely themselves go through the declensions and conjugations correctly without a grammar before them, and as for the work of translation, they seem not to have gained the first conception of what it is. To judge



them by their pupils—and it is certainly not unjust to judge of the capacities of a workman by his work—they would not be able to translate a single page of any Latin or Greek author into correct English. Multitudes of boys are sent to our colleges every year, who have never been taught to feel the difference between a correct translation, and a bungling, ungrammatical, unintelligible paraphrase. All this may seem like exaggeration, but every good instructor, who has been called upon to examine candidates for admission to college, has had ample opportunity to verify the truth of our statement. Under such training, is it strange that so few persons should form a taste for classical studies?

We might, in this connection, with much propriety, dwell upon collateral means for the study of philology, in which we are all deficient. Where are our archæological museums, with their models of ancient temples, their views of classic cities and lands, their collections of coins, their specimens of ancient statuary and other works of art, such as gems, vases, and the endless variety of articles pertaining to the life of the ancient nations? Many of our colleges have expended thousands of dollars for the illustration of the natural sciences, and they have no doubt acted wisely; but what college has provided itself with any adequate means for the illustration of historical and classical studies? The student in chemistry is not contented to be merely told what are the properties of oxygen; he must see how it is made, and he must witness the many brilliant experiments with this gas: but the classical student may count himself fortunate if his instructor can give him some general account of the mere situation of Rome and Athens. Anything like a visible representation of the life of those cities, is not to be expected. And yet the study of the classics would in our opinion be as much aided by ample illustrations, as the study of chemistry, or any other of the natural sciences. If this be so, is it strange that there should be so little enthusiasm for classical studies in this country?

Another reason why the ancient classics occupy so low a position among us, is found in the limited time which is devoted to them. Not only are the facilities for prosecuting the study extremely imperfect, but our students do not avail themselves even of the facilities which are offered, for any reasonable length of time. We are aware that some persons in this country entertain a different opinion, and complain that so much time is devoted in our schools to Latin and Greek. That this complaint is ever made by those who have any just conception of the value of the object of clas-

sical study, and of the labor requisite to attain this object, we need not deny: yet there are many whose influence is extensively felt, who look upon the classics as now occupying an improper position in an American education. Let us consider, for a moment, the place which they actually do occupy in point of time. Taking the whole country into view, we suppose two years to be a large estimate of the average amount of time devoted expressly to a preparation for college. Out of this time, one lesson a day is commonly devoted to algebra, or some other study distinct from the ancient languages. In our preparatory schools generally, about eight weeks are given annually to vacations, leaving forty-four weeks to a year. In each week, five days only are devoted to study; and on each day, one lesson, averaging not more than three-fourths of an hour in length, is given in each of the two ancient languages. Thus, allowing nothing for the ordinary irregularities in attendance, and supposing two hours (in general, a large allowance, we imagine) to be devoted to the preparation of a lesson, we have for each language a period of time equivalent to twenty-five weeks and four days! When we say equivalent to so many weeks and days, we speak of both according to the estimate of men in ordinary business, allowing six days to the week and ten hours to each day. Were a person in France or Germany studying the language of the people among whom he lived, he would, whether he desired it or not, occupy more than ten hours each day, and all of the seven days of each week, in learning. But even the above estimate of the time devoted to each of the ancient languages before admission to college, is too great: for it often happens that Greek is studied only one year instead of two, and this would give less than thirteen full weeks for Greek alone, in the preparatory school. The time devoted to Greek and Latin after entering college, is about the same as in the preparatory schools; in some colleges, it is more, and in some it is less. The fact that this amount of time is spread over three or four or five years, does not alter the case materially, for the better. On the contrary, a positive disadvantage is not unfrequently experienced by this very circumstance.

Now, what intelligent person, who understands the difficulty of mastering either the Latin or the Greek language, so as fully to comprehend its idioms, who has a view of the vast field of literature and history which lies beyond the language, and to which the language is the portal, would ever suppose such an amount of time, at all sufficient for the work to be accomplished? We should hail the man who

could achieve this, as an intellectual Hercules. Is it strange, therefore, considering the place which the classics have hitherto occupied, that the utility of the study should be questioned? We are ready ourselves to question its utility, as it has hitherto, in many instances, been prosecuted; and unless a more reasonable time can be allotted to it, especially unless that time can be employed under more competent instruction than is usual, we are ready, first of all to cry, Away with the ancient languages! banish them from all of our schools!

But how much time, it is often asked, ought to be devoted to Latin and Greek? What space should they actually occupy in a liberal education? It is not easy to answer this question. If their study really constitutes an important part of the intellectual training of youth, then they should occupy such a space as will enable them to accomplish the end for which they are designed. If we fall short of this, our plan is defective, and we waste time. In deciding upon this point, experience alone can guide men aright. In this country, experience amply proves that even in our best schools, too little time is allowed for Latin and Greek. In Great Britain, and especially in Germany, twice or thrice as much time, with incomparably better facilities for employing it, is devoted to the same object. That a liberal education acquired there, is in general far superior to ours, no reasonable man can question; and that the superiority lies principally in their classical training, we think equally clear. But it may be said, their system of education also, is acknowledged to be very imperfect; and the imperfection lies principally in the undue prominence given to classical study. This we regard as mere assertion, without the slightest proof. In the German gymnasia, the course of classical study is much more extended now than it was fifty or a hundred years ago; while at the same time, the standard of education in all of its departments has been continually rising throughout Germany. At all events, the great disparity in length between their course of classical study and ours, should lead us to grave consideration, and deter us from any hasty attempts at restriction. Such attempts, in the present state of the study among us, must lead practically to its abandonment. The full-grown oak may perhaps lose a branch or two, without detriment, but if only the two twin leaves which first appear on the infant stem be removed, the tree is destroyed. Such would be practically the effect of curtailing the course of classical study in this country.

If the question be raised, How are we to avoid such a



result, and at the same time to keep pace with the discoveries of the age in science? we would venture a suggestion. It is manifest that our colleges and universities can not remedy the evil in their course of study. The entire period of four years is insufficient for any great change. We must therefore seek for a remedy elsewhere. That which we need above all things in the educational system of this country is a class of well-organized intermediate schools; something corresponding to the gymnasia of Germany; or to Eton, Westminster and Rugby, in England; schools which shall be fitted to take the lad of nine or ten, and to carry him over the proper steps to an education, till he is eighteen. This whole period of eight or nine years should be devoted mainly, (we would by no means say exclusively,) to the study of language; for not only is it the period in life when languages can be acquired most easily, but it is far less adapted to the investigations of abstract science. In this way, the youth might enter college at the usual age, and without being essentially retarded in his scientific pursuits, should those be his choice, he would at the same time be tolerably well versed in philology, literature, and history: or should he wish to devote himself more fully to these latter studies, he would have far better prospects of ultimate success.

Another reason for the general neglect of classical studies in this country, is to be found in the prevalent idea that they are not *practical*. It is well known to other people, if not to ourselves, that we are in this country intensely practical. Nor would we have it otherwise. We would know, however, what it is to be really practical. We would be so far practical in logic, as to be misled by no popular fallacy. We would have none of our reformers in education, none of our advocates for great national universities, after having founded some polytechnic or agricultural schools pretty much after the model of those in Europe, try to deceive us with the idea that these schools are something new in the world, and that they alone furnish a practical education. What, let us inquire, is a practical education? Is it really, as men sometimes understand it, an education in science and the arts alone? Most manifestly it is not. Clearly that education is the most practical which best fits a man for the precise sphere in which he is to move. Does one wish to be a farmer, or a mechanic, or a physician, or an engineer, or an officer in the army or the navy: a scientific education is to such a man, the most directly practical. Does one wish, however, by means of language and of reasoning, to influence in various ways, other minds: to him a knowledge of language, of literature, and

of logic in its widest sense, is the most practical. Though a man may have science enough to calculate an eclipse, or even to read without a commentary, the *Mecanique Celeste*, it does not follow that he could write a good poem or construct a good plea. Such a man's education is practical, but it is not the only practical education. Galileo, and Kepler, and Leibnitz, and Newton, had without doubt, an exceedingly practical education, but not one of them could have written the *Divina Commedia*, the *Provincial Letters*, or the *Paradise Lost*. We must all acknowledge that Liebig, and Rose, and Lyell, have a practical education; and shall we deny the possession of it by Boeckh, and Ranke, and Macaulay? Had not Cicero, and Massillon, and Chatham, and Burke, and Patrick Henry, and Clay and Webster, a practical education? And yet no one of these was distinguished for his attainments in science. Away, then, with this limited idea of education. Away with this unnatural and forced opposition of literature and science. Both are practical; both are useful to every educated man.

But it is often said, in this country, that the practical benefit, if there be any derived from the study of the ancient languages, can much more easily be acquired through the study of the modern languages. It is much easier to make this assertion than to furnish examples in proof of it. For ourselves, we suppose that in acquiring the use of any instrument, it is better to practice on a good one; nor do we think that a man would be likely to acquire any particular skill in playing on the bugle, if he should confine his lessons to the jews-harp. There is, therefore, a choice in the instrument, if a man would attain any particular end. Does a man wish to make the structure and philosophy of language a study, then we suppose he should select for this purpose the most perfect specimens of human speech. That the highest perfection in the structure of language was attained by the Greeks and Romans, has seldom been questioned. Hence, the adaptation of these languages to the end in view. But that these languages, though specially, are exclusively fitted for this end, we should be the last to claim.

But to understand the philosophy of the structure of language, is only one of the ends which philology proposes to accomplish. Indeed, the mere acquisition of a language can never, properly speaking, be an end. A man learns a language because he wishes to use it. Thus, it becomes an instrument, not an end. No sensible man will be at the trouble to acquire a language, unless he can use it to some profit. What, then, is the most profitable use which can be

made of a language? Or in other words, what is it that makes any language valuable? Is it not that the language of any people, if not the only means, is the readiest means to introduce us to a knowledge of the people themselves—to the spirit of their literature, their laws, their history, in a word, to their whole character and life? How different is the situation of the traveller on the continent of Europe, who can speak the languages of the continent, from that of the man who is ignorant of these languages. While the one enjoys every possible facility for gaining a direct insight into the character of the people, the other is no better than a deaf man, and fails to comprehend more than half which passes before his eyes. How much less then, can we comprehend the character of a people whom we have never seen, and whose language we can not understand. We may hear people tell *about* them, but the knowledge thus acquired is always slender and uncertain. Why is that some of the first historians now living have studied the language of the Irish and of the Scottish Highlanders, languages comparatively worthless, except that this is the readiest means of becoming acquainted with the real character of the people, and with their affinities to the other nations of the earth? And what historian, or what liberally educated man, can fail to be interested in knowing everything possible about nations which have exerted so direct and controlling an influence on the general prosperity, the laws, the language, the thoughts, the social and political institutions, on the civilization and the religious opinions of modern times, as the Greeks and Romans?

But when we turn our attention to Greece and Rome, there is something besides the character of the people for us to study, something which we can not by any possibility understand and appreciate, without a knowledge of the languages of Greece and Rome. We refer to the immortal literary productions which are embalmed in those languages. That the Romans, and especially the Greeks, exhibited a nicer perception of the beautiful in all of its forms, than any other nations, has always been universally conceded. It was the same exquisite judgment which gave proportion and finish to the Apollo Belvidere, to the Parthenon, and to the "crowning speech" of Demosthenes; and it is just as impossible to form a correct conception of this latter without reading it, as of the former without seeing them. We should have no very high admiration for the genius of that artist who should be quite satisfied with seeing a plaster cast of the Apollo Belvidere, or of that architect who should be satisfied with seeing only a model of the Parthenon. And can



we have any higher respect for the scholar who is satisfied with reading only a translation of the oration on the crown? But, says an objector, can we not easily express all of the ideas of that oration in English? We will not so far impose upon our readers as to enter into any argument on this point. The decision of the whole question depends very much upon taste; and there is, as everybody knows, little use in disputing about taste. There doubtless are men who would not appreciate the difference in beauty between a wax doll and the finest production of Canova. To talk to such a man about the difference between the two, would be a thankless service. Were we thirsty, we should choose to repair directly to the head of the fountain, where it gushes forth, cool, and pure, and sparkling, from the rock. Should another prefer the same water, after it had coursed its way to some stagnant pool, having become warmed by the rays of the sun, and prolific with animal and vegetable life, we should probably hold no argument with him, but allow him to have his choice. So in this other, and as we deem, similar case, let every man in this free land be free to choose and free to act.

We can not conclude this topic without alluding to the opinion of the distinguished statesman and scholar, who held, for a brief period, the office of secretary of state under General Harrison; we mean the lamented and gifted Legare. At the close of a brilliant essay on Demosthenes, he says in substance,\* that for all the labor and the time which it had cost him to acquire the Greek language—a task by no means easy—he felt himself amply rewarded by being able to read the works of Demosthenes alone.

Another prevalent error which deters many persons from engaging in classical study to any considerable extent, is the idea that there is no progress in classical researches. Were this idea even well founded, it should not of necessity lead to such a result. The science of geometry, for example, has for a long time made very little absolute progress; yet the benefit of studying it, not only as a discipline of the mind, but also as an indispensable step towards the higher mathematical investigations, is apparent to every person of the slightest scientific attainment. But in philology the case is vastly different. The *dead* languages (as they are most unfortunately styled) may indeed in themselves be absolutely fixed, incapable of addition, or of discrimination, or of any other change, but not so with our knowledge of them, and

---

\* We can not repeat his language, since the essay is not at hand. It appeared in the New York Review about ten or twelve years ago.

much less with our knowledge of the treasures to which they are the only key. The visible heavens have not greatly changed since the time when they were attentively studied in the plains of Mesopotamia by Chaldean shepherds, but the science of astronomy has nevertheless, as we believe, made some progress since then. The material for any study can not, from the nature of the case, undergo any very great changes. Our earth is not much larger or smaller than that on which Roger Bacon lived, and the materials of which it is composed are not widely different now from what they were then; yet we claim to have made some progress in the science of chemistry since his day. Nor has the contour of the earth's surface changed very much since the earliest historic period; yet the geologist claims to have learned much within fifty years respecting the physical history of our globe. So it is with the materials on which the philologist and the antiquary labor; and the results in like manner have been similar. Greek and Latin remain the same that they were years ago, but they still afford ample material for investigation. Let one take the most recent and thorough history of Rome, that of Dr. Arnold, and while reading it in course from the beginning, let him mark those passages where the historian so frequently says, here is something which we do not at present understand, and which subsequent investigation will doubtless set in a clearer light; to those instances where this remark is made, let one add an equal number of other passages where it might in truth be made; it will thus become apparent that what has already been done is but a small part of what remains to be done. Let one in the next place carefully compare this same history with any one which was written fifty years before it, and some view may be gained of the progress which has been made in only half a century.\* To say nothing of the discoveries in other parts of Italy during this time, those which have been made in the vicinity of Naples alone would suffice to constitute an era in Roman life. The late researches in the Oscan language, and in the Etruscan antiquities, to which some of the best German scholars are now turning their attention, with so much zeal, may be taken as an earnest of still more valuable discoveries.

If one pass from Italy to Greece, we find fully as much progress to have been made in our knowledge of that country within the last fifty years; nor does less now remain to be accomplished than in Italy. The researches of Leake will

---

\* Niebuhr's great work on Roman History was first published in 1811.

ever constitute an era in the study of German antiquities. It may safely be asserted that our positive knowledge of this subject is two-fold what it was half a century ago. Who can estimate the value to the learned world of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Grecarum*, or of the *Staatshaushaltung der Athener* and the *Attisches Seewesen*? This latter work was published as recently as 1840, and the materials for it were furnished by Professor Ross of the University of Athens. These materials consist of inscriptions which were accidentally discovered in the year 1834, while workmen were engaged in digging for the foundation of the royal magazine in Piræus; and through the indefatigable labors of Ross and Boeckh a work has been produced on the important subject of Athenian naval affairs, which has thrown everything that ever preceded it entirely into the shade. The *Staatshaushaltung der Athener* was published in 1817. The learned author commences the preface in this manner: "Our knowledge of Hellenic antiquities has but just commenced. Abundant material is in existence, yet only a few know how to make use of it." Although Boeckh has so well understood how to make use of materials, he has himself advanced the work not far from its beginning; and were the date of his preface changed to the present time, his language might still remain true.

One of the most interesting projects in which the learned of Europe have recently been engaged, was set on foot not long ago by Professor Ross, now of the University of Halle. The plan was made known in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik*, in August, 1853. As the announcement contains some interesting points which bear upon our subject, we will present some portions of it.

"For the increase of our knowledge of antiquity, much has recently been done by the excavation of ancient monuments. In Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia, extensive researches have been undertaken by the Prussian, French, and English governments; and are still to some extent carried forward with the most brilliant success, far surpassing anything of this sort which has hitherto been undertaken in Greece. Indeed we seldom hear of any new discovery on Grecian soil. Since the restoration of the temples in Aegina, Phigalia, Carthaea and Olympia, and the labor expended on the Acropolis of Athens, as well as the researches in Asia Minor, scarcely any great, well concerted researches have been undertaken. It requires no argument to show how desirable it would be, for the enlargement of our acquaintance with ancient Greece, for the original examination of many important inquiries relating to the politics, literature, and arts of the ancients, that more numerous monuments in Greece itself should be brought forth from the protecting bosom of the earth. What service has Lord Aberdeen alone not rendered to the cause of learning by bringing to light the treasure-house in Mycenæ!"

"Many places offer themselves for our researches with the surest prospect of remunerating our labor; as for example, Delphi, the treasure-house in Or-



chomenus, the Heraeum near Argos, the temple of Nemea, the Isthmian and the Epidaurian sanctuaries, besides many other places, but scarcely one other presents so sure a prospect of valuable scientific results as Olympia: since, in Olympia, as the great national sanctuary of the Greeks, were accumulated in a small space, monuments and other interesting objects of every description; architecture of different kinds and times, sacred edifices, temples, shrines of heroes, altars, treasures, theatres, the stadium, the hippodrome, and other structures: here stood hundreds, nay, thousands of bronze and marble statues, both of gods and men,\* and the most various votive offerings. For political and literary history, however, Olympia excites peculiar expectations, in that, here on the most sacred spot in Greece, and under the protection of a divine peace, were placed stone and bronze documents respecting contracts of the most varied description between the single states (as we learn from Thucyd., v. 47.; also votive inscriptions, epigrams, and other *monumenta literata*. Of these, single specimens have been washed up through the accidental favor of the waters of the Alpheus. What light may we not expect from this source for the history of literature, of art, and of states!"

"To all this must be added another advantage. Where an ancient place has been occupied without interruption to the present day, as Athens, Thebes, Eleusis, Megara, *etc.*, there the continual necessity of obtaining new materials for building has led to the destruction of an incalculable amount; but Olympia has the advantage not to have been inhabited. It is therefore to be supposed that since its downfall, the ruins (except such as were of costly material) have remained on the spot, and are only covered with earth. This is proved by accidental discoveries of articles made of bronze; and by the inconsiderable excavation which was made with so much success by the French government."

"Winckelmann had already enlisted much interest in the plan of an excavation at Olympia; but Greece, which is separated from Italy only by the Ionian sea, appeared at that time to be farther removed from western Europe than the new world appears at the present day. The French researches scarcely deserve the name. They resulted in uncovering some portions of the temple of Zeus, and this discovery seemed a sufficient reward. The Greek government also has hitherto done nothing towards clearing up the Olympian plain. Its finances are demanded on all sides in the newly growing state. Olympia threatens still to remain a closed book, sealed with seven seals; and yet are the seals of these documents, important as they are to the past history of Greece, so easy to be opened! A more favorable locality for an excavation could not be imagined. Olympia lies a few hours from the sea, directly on the shore of a navigable stream, and opposite to the overpopulous island of Zante; so that workmen, provisions, and the necessary instruments and materials for carrying on the work, might easily be transported thither."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Should the amount of the contributions exceed our high expectations, or should it, as we by no means hope, fall below them, then the Greek government is desired, in the former case, to undertake some other similar work, together with the excavation of Olympia; in the latter case, some smaller work, as for example, the clearing out of the treasure-house in Orchomenus, or the second treasure-house in Mycenae."

The Jahrbücher, for March, 1854, contains the announcement that the sum contributed is insufficient for the project

---

\* The elder Pliny estimated that in his time there were yet three thousand statutes in Olympia.

of making excavations at Olympia ; and that it will consequently be expended for the same purpose at Mycenae.

We have presented the above, not for the sake of showing the failure of a brilliant project, but because it gives some idea of the researches which are yet without doubt to be made in Greece, and of the results which may confidently be expected therefrom. It suggests also what every historian knows full well, that our knowledge of the most interesting nations of antiquity, like that of the earth on which we dwell, and of the physical universe, is yet far from complete and satisfactory, is in fact still in its infancy. Nor need we despair of obtaining additional light in the one case more than in the other. As the history of nature is written only in scattered fragments and obscure lines, which are often concealed beneath the earth, and can only be read by the patient, thoughtful and persevering student, so the history of many races, which have lived upon the earth, and acted an important part, still lies in fragments, half concealed by the rubbish of centuries, or half defaced by the hand of time. But these precious relics shall yet be exhumed ; the scattered fragments shall yet be brought together ; and that which is now illegible shall yet be deciphered. This may not all happen in our day, but it will yet be done ; and the fact will yet be acknowledged that the intelligent and immortal races which have inhabited our earth, form a subject of study not less interesting and instructive than the physical earth itself.

Another cause, and the last which we propose to mention, which leads to the neglect of classical studies in this country, is the idea entertained by some persons that a liberal education is complete without the classics. We are well aware that this idea is not very prevalent ; for even those who lay the most stress upon what is called practical studies generally allow some space for Latin and Greek. But the very existence of the notion that they are unnecessary, leads to their neglect on the part of some persons, who would not prefer a long and difficult road to an easy and short one.

It is certainly a question of much practical interest to every youth who seeks an education, whether a knowledge of the ancient languages is in any sense necessary ; for, if it is not necessary, it costs too much time and labor to be generally sought after for mere amusement and recreation. We have not the presumption to suppose we can do much towards settling so important a question, but we await with calm confidence the time when it shall be at length settled by satisfactory induction. It must already, we apprehend, be generally conceded that the ancient languages are important

to an education in theology. If at least the theology which is studied and preached have any direct connection with the New Testament, the Greek language would seem quite necessary; and we have for ourselves always supposed that a preacher of the gospel should be able at least to read the New Testament. In this age especially, when we are all turning translators and biblical critics, a knowledge of Greek becomes quite practical. We have never fallen in with but one clergyman, whom we have heard to express any regret that so much of his time in acquiring an education was devoted to the ancient languages, instead of the physical sciences. Our surprise was very great to find even one instance of this kind; but it was somewhat diminished subsequently, when we heard that this clergyman had left his profession and engaged in the more practical business of moving houses. He probably now regrets that his entire education had not been in mechanics. We have no fear that such opinions will extend among those who propose to follow the clerical profession for life; and as we believe there will always be a clerical profession, so we have no fear that the study of the ancient languages will ever be entirely abandoned. It is perfectly certain, if Christianity be true, that Greek will continue to be studied to the end of time.

But the principal question is not whether the ancient classics are a necessary part of any professional education, but rather of a general education. Whether this question ought really to be answered in the affirmative, or in the negative, of one thing we feel quite certain, that it will be a long time before the ideas of the world generally, can be so far changed that any education without the ancient classics will be considered as liberal; and that no man who is destitute of such knowledge will at present find his education suited to the demands of the age. With the opinions which we entertain, it seems to us strange and almost unaccountable that the question should ever be raised whether the classical languages are a necessary part of a *liberal* education. In an age when we are extending our knowledge in every direction, in science, in art, and in literature; when we are pushing our researches to the ends of the world, and back almost to the beginning of time; when the oldest nations of Africa and of Asia are enlisting the attention of scholars, and when many are penetrating the darkness of the middle ages, is it not strange that we should wish to overleap the most interesting periods of the world's history, to shut our eyes to the clearest and indeed almost the only historical light which shines upon us from antiquity! It is impossible



for us to do this. We can not understand the world, we can not understand ourselves, without some knowledge of Greece and Rome. Our language, our literature, our laws, our arts, our customs, our entire civilization, are in a great measure traced back directly to Rome, and thence to Greece. Our connection therefore with these countries is so intimate that some knowledge of them must ever be to ourselves an indispensable part of a liberal education. As the Laocoon and the Apollo Belvidere must ever be admired and studied by all who have any appreciation of the plastic art, as the Pantheon and the Parthenon excite the wonder and the admiration of the architect, so the tragedies of Sophocles, the comedies of Aristophanes, the epics of Homer and Virgil, and the orations of Demosthenes and Cicero, possess an irresistible attraction for men of literary taste. As the student of art could not do without the former so long as they are accessible, so the student of literature can by no means afford to dispense with the latter.

The view which we have above presented of the condition and prospects of classical study in this country, seems in many respects discouraging. This results chiefly from the fact that we have contemplated the present almost exclusively. Should we at the same time review the past, and consider the progress which we have made in the last fifty or even in the last twenty years, we should see abundant cause for hope instead of discouragement. We may not indeed devote more time to the classics in our courses of collegiate study, but we require far greater proficiency for admission to college, and we are thus able to accomplish much more in a given time now than formerly. But what is more encouraging still, our methods of studying the languages have very greatly improved. The constant and increasing communication between this country and Germany,—where the most perfect systems of education undoubtedly exist,—has naturally led to this result. The same cause is yet in operation, and we have no doubt that the next fifty years will witness still greater improvement than the last fifty. We have but to know our imperfections, and to be pointed to the best method of remedying them. We lack neither the disposition nor the ability to make the improvement. As we already vie with the old world in many of the useful arts, and even in many branches of literature and science; so, as we have abundant reason to believe, the time is not distant when we shall cope successfully with the most learned men of Europe in the higher departments of general literature and philology.

## ART. IV.—THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

HUMAN existence may be divided into three epochs : the first extending from the commencement till death ; the second from death till the resurrection, or the end of this world ; the third, the eternity that will follow the resurrection. The second of these periods has, from its position, been denominated, the intermediate state or condition,—*state* and *condition*, in this relation being popularly used synonymously.

The question, is death to be followed by a long night of dreamless slumber, or does the spirit enjoy a conscious and active existence after the dissolution of the body, and while it is in the grave, is to us an inquiry of very deep interest. Have the patriarchs, apostles, martyrs, and all who believed in Jesus in former generations, ceased to exist ? Do they now think nothing, remember nothing, love nothing, hate nothing ? Are the wicked of all past ages, those who cursed God, trampled on his laws, oppressed and killed the saints of the Most High, in as good a condition now as those who loved the Saviour and were ready to suffer the loss of all things, and to die for the name of the Lord Jesus ?

What is the devoted Christian, in the near approach of death, to anticipate ? Is he to believe that heaven is near at hand, that when his tabernacle will be rent, he shall go forth into the sensible presence of his Redeemer ? Or is he to believe that there is nothing besides a tabernacle—that when the cloth, the poles, the cordage, the pins, have become like other dust, nothing will remain to know what a wreck has been wrought ? To the wicked, who are conscious of their condition, such an expectation can not but be agreeable. If to-morrow is to be a dreadful day, filled from morning till night with distress and anguish, who will regret that there is to be first a long night of peace and quietness ? But to the way faring man, who has for years been tossed about on the highways of the world, who has a home that he greatly loves, the thought must be oppressive, that the day is very far distant when he shall talk face to face with those who are as dear to him as his own life. Does it satisfy the deep yearnings of his soul to be told that there is, indeed, but a short step between him and his home, but that he is not to take that step now—that almost within sight of his father's house, he

is to put up at a way-side inn and spend the night in a chamber where there are no windows through which the moon and the stars may look in upon him, where no noise from without will reach him, where he will forget all his reminiscences of the past, and all his hopes of the future,—where he will be as though he had never been born, and where, so far as he knows when crossing the threshold of that singular chamber, he is to slumber a whole year, ten years, a hundred years, a thousand years, possibly millions of ages? Suppose he is assured on the best authority, that when once he has crossed the threshold, he will have neither ache nor pain, sorrow nor disappointment, that all the past, present and future will be an absolute blank, will he with such a prospect enter the door with a light step, a cheerful and thankful heart? Rather will not his very flesh creep with dreadful fear? Will he not feel like a man pushed to the very brink of an awful precipice, who holds by the frailest twigs to the giddy lip of the abyss, hears the hollow moan of the black waves hundreds of feet below him, and feels on his face the cold, clammy breath of fathomless waters? When finding himself every moment pushed farther and farther on, and knowing that presently he must drop into the slimy lake, is it sufficient consolation for the poor, trembling mortal to be told, “Be of good cheer, man, it is not as bad as it looks, a splash and a struggle, and the dingy lake will heave and sink with the same dull, monotonous sound as it does now, and as it has done for unknown ages?” To us, such a prospect would be most appalling. If such is our fixed destiny, the opposition of our nature to it can effect no change. If it must be so, let that moonless and starless night close in upon us without any premonition.

The question, Is man conscious and active between death and the resurrection? is not the same as the inquiry,—Is the spirit immortal? There may be life, and yet a partial or a total suspension of consciousness and activity, as in sleep, or swoon. Nor does it follow from the immateriality of the spirit, if that be established or admitted, that the mental faculties will be active in the intermediate state. Immateriality is a mere negation, it is a denial that the substance of the spirit is the same as that of the body. That there is a spiritual substance, to which the various mental faculties belong, seems reasonable. But when we have said, that that substance is immaterial, we have probably said all that we can say about it; and yet we have said nothing to the purpose. We do not conceive that the spirit is life, because it is immaterial, or that it lives as a necessary consequence of its



immateriality. Nor yet, does it follow from the doctrine of immateriality that the substance of the spirit is simple, or homogeneous. The body is wholly material, yet it is composed of many elements. So the spirit may be wholly immaterial, and yet be composed of many elements. These elements, for aught we know to the contrary, may be dissolved. Without any dissolution, the life of the spirit may cease, or be suspended.

It does not appear to us that any being is necessarily immortal but God himself. If we knew, but we do not at all know—of what sort of substance the spirit is made, we should not then be able to ascertain anything as to its destiny. From what we know of the spirit, both from consciousness and observation, it does clearly appear that the Maker never intended it for a limited existence.

But if the doctrine of immateriality can not essentially increase our knowledge of the condition of the spirit immediately after death, it removes all evidence, and all plausibility from the theory of the sleep or destruction of the soul, for that theory is based upon the supposition that the spirit is material. It is only on such a supposition that the proof-texts from the Bible for the sleep, or destruction of the soul, have any force. If the spirit is not identical with the body,—if it is made of a different substance, the destruction of the body does not necessarily involve the destruction of the spirit.

It is not unnatural, or absurd, to expect that the spirit will survive the death of the body, and that immediately after death it will be conscious and active. For men of all ages, of all countries, and of all degrees of civilization, have cherished such an expectation. Such an expectation was not the result of education and philosophical research, for it existed when the nations were young, as a primitive belief. The oldest poetry of all lands is full of evidence of the prevalence of such faith. The highest orders of mind believed that the ghosts or shades of the departed walked the earth, especially in the night time, that they often appeared and were recognized, that they frequently spoke and revealed secrets. There is scarcely a pagan nation, ancient or modern, among whom necromancy has not prevailed. Wizards and witches who were believed to be able at pleasure to summon up the dead and consult them, have always had a great influence among rude people. Such was the fact with the primitive inhabitants of Canaan. Though Moses legislated against such practices, yet so deeply rooted was this feeling in human nature, that in the face of severe enactments, necromancy continued among the Hebrews as late as the time of Isaiah, and perhaps much later.

Among all pagan nations the uninterrupted consciousness and activity of the spirit were considered necessary to its immortality. For of a sleep of the soul they could form no idea, as they had no knowledge or expectation of a resurrection of the body.

When men began to philosophize, we discover among the thinkers two opposite tendencies; one towards universal scepticism, either denying the very existence of the gods, or their connection with terrestrial affairs, whose motto was, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;" the other towards a firmer and more intelligent belief. Of this latter section Socrates and Plato were the most prominent. They labored, though not very successfully, to prove the immortality of the soul.

Among the Jews, both before, and at the time of Christ, the Pharisees, and with them nearly the whole nation, believed in the continued consciousness and activity of the spirit. The Sadducees were never numerous, and their partisans were always few. We do not pretend that our doctrine is true, because the Pharisees believed it; yet the fact that such was their belief, and that of nearly the whole people, is of great importance. With rare exceptions, all those Jews whom our Saviour and his disciples addressed, believed this doctrine. As this is a religious doctrine of great importance, it belonged to the teaching of Christ and his apostles. If we shall find that they were wholly silent in regard to it, we may infer that this silence was owing to the fact, that in their view the prevailing belief was correct. But if we shall find in their instructions any hints, however slight, in favor of our doctrine, such hints acquire great weight from the consideration of the prevailing belief of their hearers.

The great mass, in all ages, of those who have received the Bible as the word of God, have believed that it teaches the continued consciousness and activity of the spirit, when separated from the body; yea more, they have believed that after death it is more intensely conscious than before, of joy or sorrow, in accordance with its moral character. If almost all, who have received the Scriptures as divinely inspired, in all times and among all nations, whether learned or unlearned, have believed that they reveal the continued activity of the spirit, it is a strong presumptive evidence that they do actually teach this doctrine. We might have said that all Christians have believed thus, for the exceptions are so few, and composed of individuals of so little note as to intelligence and Christian activity, that they might be passed over in silence.

The first within the pale of the church, or who professed to be Christians, who held the opposite doctrine, were certain Arabians in the third century, who, it is said, were reclaimed by Origen from their error. Mosheim supposes that they were Epicureans before their conversion, and that their belief of the destruction of the soul in death resulted from the mixing up of their former philosophy with the gospel. The opinion has repeatedly reappeared, but under a milder name, that of a sleep of the soul. Sometimes the sleep has been held literally,—for the soul was believed to be distinct from the body, and capable of existing without it; though when separated from the body, it was supposed to be in a lethargic or an unconscious state. At other times, and more frequently, it is the old doctrine of the destructionists that reappears under a less obnoxious name.

The real foundation of this opinion is philosophical, not biblical. It comes from those who stand at the farthest remove from the gospel,—from those philosophers who deny the existence of a spiritual nature in man, and teach that the body is all of him, that the intellectual faculties and moral affections are attributes of matter, or the results of a peculiar combination of matter. All, who hold such an opinion intelligently and logically, are fatalists. For if there is no spirit, there is no freedom. The law of cause and effect extends over all nature, and excludes the possibility of an entirely new beginning originating within its own domains. Hence if there is no spirit, every thought, every act of the memory and of the imagination, and every emotion of love and of hatred, are effects of causes over which the individual can have no control, and therefore, they can not be otherwise than they are. Hence there can be no such thing as moral responsibility, or accountability. Yet uncultivated minds, and those incapable of perceiving the relations of principles, may believe that man has no spirit distinct from the body, and not reject the gospel.

The doctrine of the sleep of the soul is defended mainly on the following grounds: 1. Death is often called sleep. Every unprejudiced and common-sense reader of the Bible knows, that this is the language of figure or poetry and not of abstract truth. A corpse has the appearance of a person asleep, and therefore death has been called sleep. Faith softens the idea of death, takes away much of the dread of it; therefore, godly people in all ages have often spoke of death as sleep. Affection also for the departed, and the belief that they are resting with the Saviour, contribute much to such a representation of death. But it is only on the out-



side that death and sleep sustain some remote resemblance to each other; in their inward realities they are wholly unlike.

2. In such passages as the following, the dead are represented as being wholly at rest, as having ceased from all activities. Job 3 : 13-19; 14 : 19-22; 17 : 11-16. With these passages it might be well to compare the following from the same book. Chapter 7 : 8, 9; 14 : 5-12, 14. If the first class of passages teach that the whole man literally sleeps in the grave, the second class intimate with equal clearness that there is no waking at all from that sleep, that there is to be no resurrection. Job was obviously painfully in doubt, not only in regard to the intermediate state, but the whole of future life. The well known passage, chapter 19 : 23-27, is not opposed to this view; for that passage rightly interpreted does not teach the resurrection of the dead.

We are not authorized to take passages at random from the book of Job to prove any proposition. For Job and his friends differed widely from each other, and therefore, they could not all be right. Though God more highly approved of Job than of his three friends, he did not fully justify him. The Lord charged Job with "darkening counsel by words without knowledge." The Bible does not, therefore, teach that Job was fully inspired in all that he said.

The following passages from the Psalms harmonize in general with those referred to in the book of Job, 6 : 5; 30 : 9; 88 : 10-12; 115 : 17, 18. Let the reader carefully examine the entire Psalms, where these passages are found. These Psalms are pious hymns, the warm gushings of a devout soul. Is it necessary to believe that all such hymns are fully inspired, that every truth in them should be fully and perfectly stated? Did not the light of revelation arise gradually, and did not truths loom up to the view of those ancient saints huge and unshapen, like hills through the mists of an early morn? The truths they uttered serve not merely to teach us, but also as way-marks to designate the progress of Divine revelation. Truths were allowed to take such a form as to indicate how much of darkness was yet remaining. Though to the Psalmist the state after death, as he looked at it through the ancient dispensation, seemed at times like a formless nebula in the very distant heaven, the gospel has made known to us that there is, in that nebula, a well defined nucleus. What the Psalmist said of the dead is not true of departed saints, but it is true of the unblessed dead, and they alone are literally dead. He who "believeth" in Jesus "shall never die." Eccles. 9 : 10, may be compared with John 9 : 4. Both of these passages teach that it will

not be possible after death to do what should be done in this life.

It should ever be borne in mind, that it is one thing to believe that the speaker or actor was inspired, and therefore what he said and did was true and right; but it is another and a very different thing to believe that the individual who wrote the history of that speaker or actor was inspired. It is one thing to believe that all that Job and his friends did and said was right and true; but it is quite another thing to believe that they did actually do and say what is ascribed to them. Isaiah was inspired, but it does not hence follow that Hezekiah, of whom Isaiah wrote, was inspired, when he said, "For the grave can not praise thee, death can not celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit can not hope for thy truth. The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day."

There is a wide difference between the Old and the New Testament touching the doctrine of future life. The one is like the first gleams of morning; the other is like high noon. That the Old Testament does teach that the dead are conscious and active, that the good are happy and the wicked miserable, we need not prove by quoting particular passages. We have for our evidence the testimony of him, by whose spirit all the prophets spoke. See Luke 16 : 29-31 ; 20 : 34-38. Still, as to all that had been revealed respecting the future life before the Saviour came, the language of the apostle is singularly appropriate: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off." They saw the promises afar off in the misty distance, as the mariner beholds the dim outline of land in the far off horizon. In another place, Paul says: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." It was the Lord Jesus that first made immortal life *luminous*. Before him it was encompassed with many doubts, and involved in much painful obscurity. To the Old Testament saints, the land of the dead was a land of silence and of shade. Their eyes could not penetrate its deep obscurity, and their ear caught no silent whisper brought thence. But all places are naked and open before our Saviour. He never said that the dead are unconscious, that they know and feel nothing; but much to the contrary of this. He has assured us, that he who followeth him *shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life*. "I will not," said he, "leave you comfortless." If the dead are unconscious, they can not be said to be *uncomfortable*, but surely they must be *comfortless*.

Our Saviour exploded the philosophic dogma on which the death or sleep of the soul is founded. If the soul is material, the sword can kill it, the fire can burn it, and the water can drown it. But Jesus said that all that men can do is to kill the body, they can not kill the soul. The body, therefore, may be destroyed, and the soul remain alive, conscious and happy. Jesus said again, that he who believeth on him *hath eternal life*, or immortal happiness. He does not say, that he will have it, but that he has it now. How can this life be immortal if the enjoyment of it is to be suspended for thousands of years? Again, "Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." To say that though the believer may never die, he may sleep a countless number of ages, is only to play with words; for the sleep of the soul, which some advocate, is really and truly death.

The Saviour taught that the Patriarchs were in a state of conscious activity in the time of Moses, yea, in his own time. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him." Jehovah is the God of those only who love, trust and obey him. He was the God of the Patriarchs, four hundred years after the death of the last of them: their souls, therefore, were neither dead nor in a dreamless sleep. The Saviour quoted the passage as involving a general truth. It was not true only of those three fathers that their spirits were active and conscious after death; the same is true of all men, "for all live unto him." The reply of Jesus to the penitent thief is of the same character. "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." The pointing of this verse proposed by our opponents does not deserve serious criticism. "Verily I say unto thee to-day, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Did the thief need to be told when the promise was given?

Jesus also taught that the spirits of the wicked as well as those of the righteous survive the death of the body. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died and was buried, and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." This was not after the resurrection; for, while the rich man was in hell, his five brothers were on earth.

We find evidences of the same doctrine in the epistles of Paul. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that,



whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are confident, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." To be absent from the body was to die, and death was to be immediately followed by a direct and intimate knowledge of the Lord, here denominated, *to be present with him*. When violent death seemed probable, and near at hand, the apostle looked upon the subject in the same light. In view of life and death, as they presented themselves to his mind, he said, "I know not which to choose. For I am in a strait bewixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better; but to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." To abide in the flesh, was to live on and labor. To depart was to die. For him personally, it was far better to depart than to live. But if to die is to be unconscious,—to know, to feel, and to remember nothing, would such an utter blank have been far better than such a life as Paul lived? Would he have been in haste to depart from such various useful activities and enjoyments into such dreary nothing? If, when he was ready to be offered and the hour of his departure had come, there were still an unknown number of ages between him and blessedness, how could he say, "*Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness?*"

Paul exhorts the Hebrews, "Not to be slothful, but to be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." Those who inherit the promises are the Old Testament saints. They inherit the promises now. He represents the same individuals as taking a deep interest in those who are still on the arena: "Wherefore we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight," &c. One of these was translated without seeing death; but we are not told that Enoch enjoyed any privilege above the other saints. The spirits of just men made perfect, were all members of the church of the first-born in heaven.

The following passages in Revelation, teach the same doctrine. Chapter 6: 9, 10, may possibly have another meaning. The souls under the altar may be the murdered lives of the martyrs. Their blood poured out under the altar, like that of the sacrifices under the law, called on God for vengeance. In chapter 5: 9, 10; 7: 9-17; 14: 1-5, 13; 18: 20; 19: 1-3, the spirits of just men made perfect are represented as in a state of lofty consciousness and exalted bliss, and that between death and the resurrection.

Having now, as we think, sufficiently proved that the spirits of both good and bad men do not perish with the body, but

are conscious and active between death and the resurrection, we shall now endeavor to ascertain what has been revealed respecting their place of abode, and condition.

Their place of abode is designated in the Bible by various names. The principal of these are the following:

I. **שְׁאוֹל** Sheol. The word occurs in the Old Testament sixty-five times. It is translated by the LXX., by <sup>ο</sup> *Ἅδης*, Hades, except in 2 Sam. 22: 6; Prov. 23: 14, where it is translated by *θανάτος*, Thanatos, and Ezekiel 32: 21, where it is rendered *βόθρος*, Bothros. The clause where sheol occurs in Job 24: 19, is wanting in the LXX. In the English Bible it is translated *hell*, thirty-three times; *grave*, twenty-nine times, and *pit*, three times. **שְׁאוֹל** according to its etymology, signifies *asking* or *demanding*. Gesenius derives it from an obsolete verb, signifying to *make hollow*. The former pedigree of the word is the more obvious, and it is equally applicable. In like manner, we speak of the "insatiable archer," and of the "greediness of the grave." Sheol is represented as a heartless, greedy claimant, who never says "*enough*."

In the mouth of the Hebrew, *sheol* was the name of a vast, terrible and shapeless idea. When the term is literally used, with all its fullness of meaning, it signified the lowest division of the universe, extending indefinitely from the surface of the earth downward. The earth was supposed to be a plane spreading out, without measure, in all directions. The grave was considered both as the entrance into sheol and as a part of it. But the word is frequently used with a more limited application, as referring to a part, and not to the whole, sometimes to the *grave* merely, and sometimes exclusively to the lowermost depths, and sometimes it is used figuratively.

Sheol is ever represented as being below. Those who go there are said to descend, and those who leave it, are said to ascend. And still more, it is represented as being very deep. Deut. 32: 22; Job 11: 8; Psalm 139: 8; Amos 9: 2. It is morally deep. Isaiah 57: 9. As it is far off from the heaven that gives light, and on the under side of the opaque earth, it is a region of darkness, in a state of utter confusion, as this earth at the beginning. Job 10: 21, 22. In consequence, no man can see it; its depth is known only to God. Job 26: 6; Prov. 15: 11. On account of these characteristics of sheol, Jonah (chap. 2: 3) called the belly of the fish by that name. One might, therefore, be safely hid there from the storms of this earth. Job 14: 13. These passages may be considered as giving the geography of sheol.

We said that the term is sometimes used to signify only

a part of that vast region. In the following passages it means the grave merely. Gen. 37 : 35 ; 42 : 38 ; 44 : 29, 31. Jacob spoke of descending to sheol, precisely as we do, of going down into the grave. There is no kind of necessity to suppose that he intended anything more. It means the same, also, in these passages : Job 17 : 13, 16 ; Prov. 1 : 12 ; Isaiah 38 : 10, 18. In the following places it signifies the grave, when we use it in a general way, as synonymous with death : 1 Sam. 2 : 6 ; 1 Kings 2 : 6, 9 ; Job 7 : 9 ; 21 : 13 ; 24 : 19 ; Psalm 6 : 5 ; 16 : 10 ; 30 : 3 ; (compare this last passage with 2 Cor. 1 : 10 ; ) 88 : 3 ; 89 : 48 ; 116 : 3 ; 141 : 7.

As we often represent death and the grave as a most greedy and pitiless destroyer, so is sheol spoken of. Prov. 27 : 20 ; 30 : 16 ; Hab. 2 : 5 ; Canti. 8 : 6. It is therefore used as a symbol of the most cruel and mighty enemies. 2 Sam. 22 : 6 ; Psalm 18 : 5 ; 86 : 13 ; Hosea 13 : 14.

In the following passages, it is used in its full meaning, including the grave where the body is destroyed, and also the greater deep where wicked spirits are tormented : Num. 16 : 30, 33 ; Psalm 55 : 15. In these places, indeed, the idea of the grave is not very prominent. The image presented is the reverse of that of Enoch and Elijah. As these ascended to heaven without seeing death ; so those descended into sheol without dying. The second death overshadowed the first. Psalm 49 : 14, 15 ; Isaiah 14 : 9, 11, 15 ; Ezekiel 31 : 15-17 ; 32 : 21, 27.

In the following places, the idea of the grave is excluded, and the word is applied to the lower depths, where sinners end their course, and God reckons with them. Psalm 9 : 17 ; 31 : 17 ; Prov. 5 : 5 ; 7 : 27 ; 9 : 18 ; 15 : 11, 24 ; 23 : 14 ; Eccles. 9 : 10 ; Isaiah 28 : 15, 18. About two of these passages there may be some doubt. In Prov. 15 : 11, hell is not referred to as a place of punishment, but as a very secret place. But here sheol is joined with destruction and the two words are used as names of the same thing. Eccles. 9 : 10, may be considered as an exhortation addressed to a godless person, and may be explained by reference to John 9 : 4. In one place, it is said that there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in sheol. The Saviour says that the *night* cometh when no man can work. That night will not overtake the believer, and he will not go into sheol, where nothing is to be done.

We have intended to give all the passages where sheol occurs. It is possible that some have been overlooked. The classification of the passages may not be perfect. If the reader will take the pains to consult them all with their con-



texts, he will find that the word is not used with an entire uniformity of meaning. Sometimes only some characteristics of the place are referred to, sometimes the reference is only to a part; often nothing more than the grave is intended. It is not grave as a pit dug in the earth, though the language is somewhat governed by that, but the grave, as we often use it, when we do not think so much of the body being buried in the ground, as of our passing away from this life to the state of the dead. When Jacob spoke of descending into sheol to his son, such evidently was his idea. There is no reason to think that he expected, as to his spirit, to descend into the lowest sheol.

There is no evidence that it was the belief of the ancient saints that the spirits of the righteous entered into sheol; there is no passage in the Old Testament that declares they are there. It has been generally believed that sheol is the name of the intermediate state, and that the spirits both of the just and unjust are there. But such belief has not been owing to a careful examination of the Old Testament, but rather to the supposition that *Hades* is exactly equivalent to sheol. In classic Greek, it is well known that *Hades* is the general name of the spirit-world, into which all mankind after death enter. It has further been supposed that *Hades* in the New Testament and in the LXX., has the same meaning as in profane authors. And, therefore, the conclusion is that *sheol* is the general name of the spirit-world, the common abode of the just and of the unjust.

• There are two passages in the Old Testament from which it might be inferred that sheol is the abode of the righteous as well as of the wicked: Psalm 16 : 10, "For thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell*; neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." There are two ways of understanding this passage. 1. *Nephesh*, translated *soul*, does not necessarily mean the rational part; indeed, such is not its prevailing meaning. It signifies frequently, *life*. With suffixes, where it is rendered, *my soul*, *thy soul*, *his soul*, *etc.*, it means no more than *myself*, *thyself*, *himself*, *etc.* In our passage, then, *my soul*, may mean, *my life*, or simply, *myself*. Sheol may mean simply *grave*, when used as nearly equivalent to death. The passage then, may be rendered, "Thou wilt not leave me in the grave or in death." This rendering would suit well the second half of the sentence, according to the Hebrew parallelism.

2. The passage is quoted by Peter, and *nephesh* is rendered by  $\psi\chi\eta$ , *Psyche*. This word is often used to signify the immortal part of man. If *nephesh* has such a meaning in

the psalm, and sheol signifies the lower world, it does not follow that the spirit of the Redeemer entered that region; the contrary is asserted, "Thou wilt not leave, or abandon, my soul unto sheol." The preposition prefixed to sheol, in the passage, signifies motion toward, and not rest in. The phrase is elliptical, and may be filled out thus: Thou wilt not leave my soul to enter into sheol, or, Thou wilt not leave my soul unto the power of sheol. Peter translates the Hebrew literally: "Thou wilt not abandon my soul unto *hades*." Thou wilt not permit me to enter there.

The other passage is Hosea 13:14. Paul applies the latter part of the verse to the resurrection. It might, therefore, seem that the righteous are redeemed from sheol, or *hades*. Must they not, then, have entered that place previous to their being redeemed? But the prophet does not appear to have any reference to the resurrection. In him, death and sheol represent the most cruel and powerful enemies, who oppress the people of God. From the hand of all such the Lord promises to deliver his people. Though the prophet had no particular reference to the resurrection, yet the apostle rightly quotes it in connection with that doctrine; for when the resurrection will have been effected, the promise will have been accomplished in all its fullness of meaning.

Not only is there no evidence in the Old Testament that righteous spirits go into sheol; much to the contrary is found there. If the just go into sheol, what is the meaning of the threatening, "The wicked shall be turned into sheol, and all the nations that forget God?" Death is the king of sheol. "Like sheep are they laid in sheol, death shall reign over them." Psalm 49:14. If all go down into sheol, what is there peculiar in a debauched life? Prov. 5:5; 7:27; 9:18. Still more, what is that upward path of the wise, that he may escape from sheol beneath? Prov. 15:24. How can proper discipline deliver from sheol, if all must go there? Prov. 23:14.

That the wicked are conscious in sheol, is obvious from the fact that it is represented as a place so dreadful, toward which all the various courses of sin converge, and in the darkness of which they are finally lost. In the book of Job there is a vagueness and an uncertainty about the word. The good man looked with an anxiously inquiring mind, through the mouth of the grave into the spirit-world, but the glimmer that he saw was far more like darkness than light. Yet he expressed his belief that sheol was naked before God, that destruction had no covering from him; and that the *shades below*, the *Rephawim*, the departed spirits, who inhabit sheol, tremble before God. Job 26:5, 6. As the revelation of

God progresses, we find the word *sheol* used with more definiteness. Solomon, in the book of Proverbs, employs it with much precision, and very near in the same sense as we use an unblest death and hell. He also says that the *Rephawim* are in the depths of *sheol*. Prov. 9 : 18. Isaiah's description of the descent of the king of Babylon into *sheol*, takes for granted that the *Rephawim*, the spirits of wicked men, are there. Isaiah 14 : 9.

The righteous, on the contrary, *ascend* at death. God is said to dwell above. God took Enoch to dwell with himself. It is very probable that he took him up in the sight of the people, just as he did Elijah, so as to teach men that the home of the righteous is above. The psalmist said that the righteous shall dwell in the tabernacle of Jehovah, in his holy hill. Psalm 15. The path of life leads upward. Prov. 15 : 24. So also taught Isaiah, chap. 33 : 15-17. The faith and hope of Asaph were of the same nature, "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. Whom have I in heaven but thee." Psalm 73 : 24, 25.

II. Ἀδης. There can be no doubt that Hades in heathen Greek, signifies the Invisible World, in the most comprehensive sense. The LXX., with three exceptions, have translated *sheol* by *hades*. They also translated several other Hebrew words and phrases, which signify about the same thing as *sheol*, by *hades*; as, *tsalmawveth*, (shadow of death,) Job 38 : 17; *dhumah*, (silence,) Psalm 94 : 17, 115 : 17; *mawveth*, (death,) Prov. 14 : 12, 16 : 25; *Abne-bhor*, (stones of the pit,) Isaiah 14 : 19; and *bhor*, (pit,) Isaiah 38 : 18.

The use of *hades* in the Apocrypha, corresponds very nearly to *sheol* in the Old Testament. It must also be used in the same sense as in heathen Greek, to signify in general, the *invisible* or *spirit* world. In the following places it has the meaning of *death*, or *grave*. Ananias, Azarias and Misael praise the Lord, "Because he hath delivered us from Hades, and from the hand of death hath saved us." They may have meant something more by *hades* than mere death. They may have intended to call the *fiery furnace* by that name. Verse 65. "For thou hast authority over life and death, and thou bringest down into the gates of *hades*, and leadest up." Wisdom of Solomon 16 : 13. The second half of the verse repeats in other words the idea expressed in the first half, as in 1 Sam. 2 : 6. It may possibly have a wider meaning; it may refer to the spiritual part of man. "Remember that death will not tarry, and a covenant with *hades* has not been shown thee. Give and receive, and pass thy time agreeably, for there is no seeking food in *hades*." Sirach 14 :



12, 16. In the 12th verse, *hades* may possibly have the general meaning of *spirit-world*, according to the usage of heathen Greek. "Who will praise the Most High, in *hades*, as the living do, even the living and those who give thanks?" Sir. 17 : 27. "This is the judgment of the Lord upon all flesh, and why shouldest thou wholly oppose the will of the Most High? There will be no inquiry made in *hades* whether the years of thy life were ten, or a hundred, or a thousand." Sir. 41 : 4. Elijah "raised a dead person by the word of the Most High, from death and from *hades*." Sir. 48 : 5. "From *hades*," may be considered as a simple amplification of the phrase, "from death." It is, however, possible that the meaning may be, that Elijah called up the spirit from *hades*, in the heathen sense of this word. Eleazar, one of the principal scribes, when tempted to do what was not lawful, that he might save himself from death, "deliberately answered them, telling them to send him quickly to *hades*." 2 Mac. 6 : 23. He preferred dying to sinning.

In Wisdom of Solomon 1 : 14, *hades* is used as the embodiment of destructiveness. "For he created all things that they might continue; the generations of the world (were intended to be) healthy; and there is among them no destructive poison, (*φαρμακον*), nor is there a royal mansion of *hades* upon earth."

In the following places the heathen meaning of *hades* is more evident: "For they (wicked unbelievers) say in themselves, not reasoning correctly, Short and afflictive is our life, and in the end there is no remedy for man, and it is not known that one has ever been released from *hades*." Sir. 2 : 1. It is not absolutely necessary that *hades*, in this passage should mean anything more than *death*, or *grave*; for the speakers probably had no real belief in existence after death. "Thou hast delivered me from the deep cavern of *hades*, and from an unclean tongue and from a lying discourse. . . . My soul (*ψυχη*) drew near unto death, and my life (*ζωη*) was near *hades* underneath." Sir. 51 : 5, 6. Here also *hades*, in the first instance, may mean *death*, or *great misery*, and in the second place, *death*, simply. The result is this: *Hades*, in the Apocrypha, may have in a few instances, the meaning it has in the heathen Greek; yet in all cases, the word will make as good and fitting sense without giving it such a signification.

In the following places, *hades* corresponds very nearly to our general idea of *hell*: "For they sleeping the same sleep, on that night truly dreadful, and coming from intolerable *hades*, . . ." Wisdom of Solomon 17 : 13. "Be not

thou delighted with what pleases the ungodly; remember that they shall not be acquitted, till (they have descended) into hades." Sir. 9 : 12. "The way of sinners is leveled from stones, (*i. e.*, made smooth by having the stones removed,) but in its latter end is the pit of hades." Sir. 21 : 10. "The death of it, (*i. e.*, inflicted by the tongue,) is an evil death, and hades is to be preferred to it," *i. e.*, the calumniating tongue. Sir. 28 : 21.

These, according to Tromm's Concordance, are all the places where *hades* occurs in the Apocrypha. The word is used very much in the same sense as Sheol in the Old Testament. Though in a few instances, it may have the signification of *invisible world*, or world of spirits, there is no clear statement that it was an article of faith among the pious, that the spirits of just men entered hades. God received the righteous to himself. Wisdom of Solomon 3 : 4-8, 5 : 15, 16.

The use of Hades in the New Testament.

1. Figurative use of the word, "The gates of hades shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16 : 18. The phrase, *πύλαι ᾗδου*, is found only this once in the New Testament. It occurs once in the LXX., Isaiah 38 : 10, and once in the Apocrypha, Wisdom of Solomon 16 : 13. The phrase has the same meaning in the last two passages. The *gates* form the entrance into a place. Sheol, or the underworld, was entered through the grave, or death; hence, it was called the gates of sheol. If *πύλαι ᾗδου* have the same signification in Matt. 16 : 18 as in Isaiah 38 : 10, the meaning of our Saviour's promise is simply this, "*Believers will not all die out from the earth.*" Was this all that Jesus intended? It is obvious on the very face of the passage that the Saviour speaks of *the gates of hades* as being peculiarly hostile to the church, as seeking its destruction, as making assaults upon it. If the *gates* of hades cherish against the church no bitter animosity, and make no powerful attacks upon it, we can attach no adequate meaning to the promise, that *they shall never prevail against it*. Death is, by no means, the worst enemy that the church of Christ has to encounter. And least of all, is an unblest death, a death to be followed by hades, an enemy to the church. Isaiah 38 : 10, according to the LXX., ought not to control the interpretation of Matt. 16 : 18, unless it can be first shown that hades in the New Testament, corresponds exactly to sheol in the Old Testament. But we shall presently see that the two terms are not used precisely alike.

By the *gates of hades*, in Matt. 16 : 18, we understand all the enemies of the church, both angelic and human—all who

hate it, and labor to destroy it. All the forces that Satan can muster and pour forth through the gates of hades can avail nothing against the church which Christ himself has built on the rock.

"O death, where is thy sting? O hades, where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. 15 : 55. In the second member of this verse, Tischendorf reads *θανατε* instead of *ᾗδῃ*. "The critical authorities," says Olshausen, "are in fact strongly in its favor." Any one may easily satisfy himself that such is the case from an inspection of Tischendorf's marginal note. But on the supposition that these words are quoted from Hosea 13 : 14, Olshausen prefers *ᾗδῃ*, because that corresponds to both the Hebrew text and that of the LXX. The Hebrew of this passage,—rightly rendered in English except *sheol*, by grave,—is not literally translated by the LXX. They read "*ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου, θανατε; ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ᾗδῃ;*" "Where is thy victory, death? where is thy sting, hades?" The words of Paul—*ποῦ σου θάνατε τὸ κέντρον; ποῦ σου θανατε (ᾗδῃ) το νικος;*—do not correspond either to the Hebrew, or to the LXX. It is not certain that Paul intended to quote Hosea 13 : 14. It is very certain he did not quote it literally. There is, therefore, but little force in the argument, that because the Hebrew text of Hosea 13 : 14 has *sheol*, and the Greek *ᾗδῃ*, Paul must have written *ᾗδῃ* in 1 Cor. 15 : 55. But suppose *ᾗδῃ* is the correct reading, what is the meaning of the passage? The chapter treats only of the resurrection of the righteous, for it is of them only that resurrection, in the proper sense of the term, can be predicated. Does hades here mean the underworld; and are the spirits of the just raised from there? For if not raised from there, why the triumphant exclamation—"O hades, where is thy victory?" It is of the resurrection of the body that the apostle speaks. There is no clear reference in any part of the chapter to disembodied spirits. If the spirits of the just are to be raised from hades, as well as their bodies from the dust, it would be rather singular that the apostle, when discussing so much at large the doctrine of the resurrection, should dismiss the very important subject of the escape of the spirits of the just from hades, with a few words of exultation. As the victory of Christ over death,—the last enemy, is the subject throughout, better far is it to consider hades as synonymous with death, and used merely for the sake of variety;—especially as *sheol*, and *hades*, in the Old Testament frequently have such a signification. But better still is it, to give to the words of Paul a far wider application. It is wholly in harmony with his very exultant feelings, to suppose that by *death* and *hades*, he intended all the



enemies of the righteous, especially the most powerful and fiendish of them. This view of the passage perfectly agrees with Hosea 13:14. For though the prophet had no particular reference to the resurrection, yet it is only when that event will have passed, that the promise in the prophet will have been accomplished in all its fullness of meaning. It corresponds also with Matt. 16:18. The Saviour predicted that the *gates of hades* should not prevail against the church; while Paul, as if standing at the time of the end, beholds the church ascending triumphantly from the conflict, and taunts her enemies with their complete failure.

"And I saw, and behold a pale horse, and he who sat upon him, his name is death, and hades followed after him." Rev. 6:8. The only thing that is figurative about the use of hades in this verse, is—that it is represented as being in motion. "The four seals turn upon living men; and so death, by which they are carried off, is most prominently represented, but hades, only in so far as he receives those who have been cut off by death, acting as death's hearse, on which account no separate horse is assigned him." (Bengel.) Death here is not death in general, but the death of the wicked,—an unblest death, and caused by the terrible judgments of God. As soon as the ungodly are cut off by death they enter hades. What is their condition in hades we may learn from Rev. 14:9-11.

"And the sea gave up the dead who were in it; and death and hades gave up the dead who were in them; and they were judged, each one, according to their works. And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, the lake of fire." Rev. 20:13, 14.

As nothing is said previously in this book about the sea giving up the dead, we may suppose that the dead here spoken of embrace all that were in the sea. Among these there were no righteous persons found. All of them were afterwards cast into the lake of fire. But good men, as well as bad, are drowned in the sea, or die on the sea, and their bodies cast into the deep. The literal sea cannot, therefore, be intended in the passage under consideration. Hengstenberg, rightly, as we think, regards the sea as a symbol of the nations or peoples who inhabit the earth, in contradistinction from those who are written in the book of life of the Lamb. All the nations are regarded as one. The dead in the sea are not those who have passed away from the earth, but the spiritually dead—*i. e.*, sinners in the flesh. The sea, therefore, is identical and coextensive with the dead who are in it. The sea will give up the dead—*i. e.*, the nations will resolve

their unities into individuals. After this, *there will be no more sea.*

The dead in "death and hades" are all the sinners who have departed from this world. But who are the death and hades who give up these dead? As the dead in the sea were identical with the sea itself, only viewed under a different aspect, why may not death and hades be regarded as identical with the dead in them; for death and hades regarded as conditions—and death surely can be considered as nothing else—are realized in wicked spirits who have passed away from this earth. *Death* has no separate existence—*Hades*, indeed, may be a locality as well as condition, and may, therefore, without incongruity be represented as being cast into the lake of fire. But as this cannot be said of death, and as the two are so intimately united, it seems preferable to treat them alike. It is not said that the dead who were in death and hades were cast into the lake of fire, but simply that death and hades themselves were cast. Is it not perfectly legitimate, therefore, to consider *death* and *hades* as standing for the dead who were in them—or rather, the dead in whom they were?

Were it not for the incongruity of the imagery, John might have said, that the sea was cast into the lake of fire, as well as death and hades. But a sea could not well be cast into a lake. Therefore, in order to retain the naturalness of the representation, the sea was dropped, and the idea was expressed in another form—*viz.*, "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." The passage under consideration refers to the doings and results of the final judgment. The sinners who will be alive at the coming of Christ—and all those who will have died in their guilt previous to that time, will be gathered before the great white throne, and will be sent away into everlasting punishment. If we have rightly interpreted the passage, there is no comparison or contrast made between hades and the lake of fire. Nor does it follow from anything that is said here, that the wicked dead, after the resurrection, will not go to the same place as they were in before. Neither can we infer from the fact that they will be cast into the lake of fire, that their condition will be any more painful than it was before. This will presently become more manifest.

In all these passages, while the term *Hades* is used more or less figuratively, its primary and literal meaning is ever prominent. We do not mean its literal signification in heathen Greek, but in the New Testament.

## 2. Hades, in the sense of sheol.

We have already referred to Acts 2:27, 31, while discussing the meaning of sheol. But in order to have a complete view of all the passages where hades occurs, it may not be amiss to return to it. Peter may have spoken in the Hebrew that was then used, and quoted the passage as it stood in the Hebrew text, and Luke translated it into Greek. The meaning of hades here is to be determined by that of sheol in Ps. 16:10, rather than by the use of hades in the New Testament. If *ψυχή* here signifies the spiritual, immortal part—and hades means the lower world—the world of darkness and of punishment, then the literal rendering of the clause is, "Because thou wilt not leave my soul [to descend] into hades." But it is important to observe that when our Saviour died, it was not his *ψυχή* that he committed into the hand of his Father, but his *πνεῦμα*. Luke 23:46. The same also was the case with Stephen. Acts 7:59. But better is it to give to hades, in the passage under consideration, the meaning of *death* or *grave*—a frequent signification of sheol, though the New Testament writers themselves never use the word in that sense. As *ψυχή* very frequently means *life*, the passage presents no difficulty.

But is it not said that Christ descended into the lower parts of the earth? Eph. 4:9. Do not the lower *parts of the earth* signify the same thing as *hades*? It is sufficient, for our present purpose, simply to remark that this descent into the lower parts of the earth is not predicated of the spirit of Jesus, but of his Divinity. It is only in regard to God that the reasoning of the apostle can have any force. What should we think if Paul had inferred from the ascension of Elijah into heaven, that he must first have descended into the lower parts of the earth? We conceive of God as dwelling in the highest place, and, therefore, it is always implied; when he is said to ascend, that he had previously descended. But the descending and ascending of God are not to be understood of location, but of condition. In the case before us, he descended into the lower parts of the earth when he emptied himself—took upon him the form of a servant—and became obedient even to dying on the cross.

But did he not go and preach to spirits in prison? 1 Peter 3:18. And when did he go, if not when his body was in the tomb? In regard to this difficult passage, it is sufficient for us to inquire what is meant by the *Spirit*—in whom, or by whom he was quickened—and in whom he went and preached. Does it mean the human spirit of Jesus—or his Divinity? If his human spirit, in what respect could that be



said to be quickened? That did not die, or sleep. If it should be said that it was raised after death into a higher state of consciousness and activity, and that this was the quickening, it may be replied that the same thing happens to all departed spirits. For what purpose, therefore, would the apostle mention such a fact? But if it be understood of the Saviour's divinity, we perceive that the statement is relevant to the apostle's purpose, and is full of the most glorious meaning. The Divine nature of the Messiah, from his incarnation to his death, had submitted itself to some great and painful privations and limitations. His death was to him like the rending of a dark and almost impervious cloud that had shut out from the earth the light of the sun. His death resulted in his disenthralment from his depressed condition, and the immeasurable enlargement of his power and efficiency. Thus understood, the passage gives no countenance to the descent of the human spirit of Jesus to hades, when his body was in the tomb.

### 3. The literal meaning of hades in the New Testament.

We shall commence with Luke 16 : 23, 24. This passage contains the plainest and fullest description of hades. We are told here that hades is not a mere place of imprisonment, where departed spirits are kept to await the judgment of the last day. It is a place of punishment, of dreadful torments. It is not necessary to suppose that the place is literally filled with flames, or that there is any physical suffering there. The flames are a mere symbol,—but they are a symbol of inconceivable pain and distress.

The Saviour does not give us any hint that all of hades is not just the same as the spot where the rich man found himself. He does not say that the rich man was in the Tartarean half of hades, but simply that he was in hades, and being there, he was in torments. He does not intimate that the great chasm runs through hades, dividing it into two portions, and that while the sun shines on the one part, an Egyptian darkness broods over the other. The implication rather is, that the great chasm was the outer boundary of hades, which no created being, at his own option, could pass. Rev. 1 : 18 ; 3 : 7.

But was not Lazarus also in hades? It is very commonly believed that he was there, as well as the rich man, only that he was in the Elysian field, while the rich man was in Tartarus. In this article of faith, we discover the encroachment of heathenism on Christianity. The Saviour did not say that the *bosom of Abraham* was in hades. The phrase, "*bosom of Abraham*," does not occur elsewhere in the Bible.

There is no allusion here to a feast. For there is no reason to suppose that Lazarus was preferred to all other pious men, and promoted to the chief place. The expression is parallel to "the bosom of the Father." It denotes the most loving intimacy and fellowship. If it can be shown that Abraham himself was in *hades*, then it might follow that the *bosom of Abraham* was in that kingdom. If the pious are in *hades*, their prospect is surely dark enough; for all the dead whom *hades* delivered up to be judged, were cast into the lake of fire. Rev. 20:13, 14.

But if the bosom of Abraham is not in *hades*, how could the rich man see Abraham and Lazarus, and how could they converse together? This objection proceeds on the supposition that all that is here said of the spirit-world, is to be understood literally. It is obviously impossible that all should be so understood; and it is equally impossible to distinguish between what is real and symbolic. The seeing and the conversation across the impassable chasm, may have been simply supposed for the sake of bringing out vividly the conditions and feelings of both parties. But if it should be admitted that they did in fact see each other, and did converse together, nothing is gained or lost, unless it can be proved that disembodied spirits are subject to the same laws as we are here—that they can see and hear only within short distances.

Jesus said to John, "I have the keys of death and of *hades*." Rev. 1:18. Some also read *hades* instead of *David* in Rev. 3:7. As there is a very general correspondence between what the author of the seven epistles says, in the opening of each one, concerning himself, and what is found in the 1st chap. 12—20, there is a reference in the key of David, or of *hades*, chap. 3:7, to the keys of death, and of *hades* in chap. 1:18, and therefore *hades* may be the true reading in chap. 3:7, though the critical authorities appear to be against it. The death of which Jesus holds the keys, is the cursed death of the ungodly; and the *hades* over which his authority is supreme, is the very place which he himself described as being full of flames, and whose inmates are in torments. It is Jesus alone that can open and shut *hades*. Therefore, the enemies of his people, however great their might, and however furious their rage, cannot send their victims to a hopeless death, and into the *hades* of torments.

There is a striking similarity between the doctrine of these passages in Revelation, and Matt. 10:28. In the one case Jesus has the sole authority over *hades*. He shuts and no one opens, and opens, and no one shuts. In the other place,

it is asserted that God alone is able to curse both soul and body in Gehenna. Are not hades and Gehenna, then, the same place?

Hades occurs in two other passages, which are very similar to each other, though they were spoken at two different times. "And thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hades." Matt. 11:23. Luke 10:15. Our Saviour had chosen Capernaum for his residence, that he might there gather the nucleus of his church. The greatest possible advantages were granted to the people. Yet only a very few of them united themselves to Jesus by a sincere faith. The Redeemer asserted that in proportion to the immense opportunities which they had abused, would be their guilt and condemnation. As they had been raised to the very highest, so they should be thrust down to the very lowest. As heaven is the highest place, so hades is the lowest place. Now, if hades and Gehenna are not identical, where shall we place Gehenna?—we do not mean geographically, for we do not suppose that by the *up* and the *down* in these passages, our Saviour had any reference to geographical directions. If the punishment of the wicked after the day of judgment will be heavier than that of spirits in the intermediate state, it is not necessary that that punishment should be inflicted in Gehenna rather than in hades; for, according to the passages under consideration, Gehenna cannot be lower, *i. e.*, more truly dreadful, than hades.

It is not necessary to remark that, to predicate what our Saviour says in these passages, of Capernaum, in its corporate capacity, and of its temporal condition and interest, would be a wicked evasion, rather than a just exposition. True, its glory has departed—its very site is problematical. But that is no more than has happened to most of the cities and villages of the land of Israel. Of what possible consequence to the then wicked inhabitants of Capernaum would it be that the time would come when their city would cease to exist?

We have now examined all the passages where *hades* is used in the New Testament. The result is this: *Sheol*, in the Old Testament and *Hades* in the New Testament, though nearly related, are not exactly corresponding terms. *Sheol* is more comprehensive, and is used with much greater vagueness than *hades*. *Sheol* includes the grave, or death irrespective of its nature,—as blessed, or cursed; and not only so, but frequently it obviously means nothing more than grave;—not so much the grave as a place, as the grave as condition. Hades, in the New Testament, is never used in such a sense, unless it be in the quotation



from Ps. 16 : 10, in Acts 2 : 27, 31. Sheol also is used to signify a very low and afflictive condition. Hades never has any such meaning. The central idea of *Sheol* is surrounded by a wide fringe—by many attributes with which the exuberant, but untutored imagination of the young world had encompassed it. In the New Testament, under the term *hades*, the same idea stands forth, naked and well defined. An exception ought to be made in favor of Proverbs, where *sheol* is used with much uniformity in the same sense as *hades* in the New Testament. In that book, with, perhaps, two exceptions, *sheol* is the place of darkness towards which all the ways of sin converge, and in which they are lost—into which the wicked only enter. So in the New Testament, *hades* is the abode of the unblessed dead only.

*Gehenna* occurs twelve times in the New Testament, eleven times in the Gospels, Matt. 5 : 22, 29, 30 ; 10 : 28 ; 18 : 9 ; 23 : 15, 33 ; Mar. 9 : 43, 45, 47 ; Luke 12 : 5, and once in James 3 : 6. The meaning of this term is made abundantly obvious, by certain descriptive words and phrases which are generally added. We have already intimated that *Gehenna* and *Hades* are the same. Yet they are not directly identified. The two words never occur in the same connection. It is nowhere expressly said that wicked spirits go directly into *Gehenna* after death. But the punishment of *Gehenna* is brought by the Saviour to bear directly on living men. Entering into life, and entering into *Gehenna*, are opposed as corresponding events. As the pious enter into life, when they depart from this world, so, we may suppose, the wicked enter *Gehenna*, when they die. From all the passages where *Gehenna* is used, we never should infer that wicked spirits shall not go into that place till after the day of judgment.

If the two are not the same, they are precisely alike. There is *Gehenna*—of fire—of unquenchable fire ; *Hades* is full of flame. In the one, the worm dies not, and the fire is not quenched ;—in the other, the inmate shall be tormented without the least prospect of release. God alone can cast men into *Gehenna*. Jesus alone has the keys of *hades*. The righteous, as we shall presently see, go at death into their final place of happiness. Why, then, do not the wicked go immediately after death, into their final place of punishment ? The righteous will receive an enhancement of glory and happiness after the resurrection. But that will be owing to a change in their constitution, and not in their abode. So also, the misery of the wicked may after the same period, and through a like change in their constitution, be increased. A change of location will not be necessary to effect such an

increase. The lake of fire conveys no more terrible idea than that of hades full of flame.

As to the location of *Hades* or *Gehenna*, we find no information. That it is a cavern in the earth, or under it, we have no reason to believe. Such was the conception that men in ancient time formed of it. The Divine revelation of the spirit-world loomed up through such a conception, as the sun rises through masses of fog. As the sun, in ascending, dissipates the mists, so the revealed truth in regard to the future state, worked itself clear from all the earthly elements with which it had been united, and which seemed, for a while, to have formed a part of it. Though in the New Testament it is still seen as an object afar off, its general outlines are fearfully distinct.

*What does the New Testament teach respecting the abode of the spirits of just men made perfect?* It is, we think, very clearly and abundantly revealed that the spirits of the faithful enter the highest glory immediately after death. Our Saviour when about to die, said: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." By the *hands* of God in such a connection, we are not to understand his protecting power, which the Saviour always fully enjoyed, but the consoling presence of the Father, to be enjoyed by him far out of the reach of all toil and suffering. This is confirmed by the last words of Stephen, to which they bear a striking resemblance. When that first martyr was about to die, he saw the heavens (not hades) opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God, and said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." There is no heaven higher, no glory greater, no blessedness more perfect, than that which Jesus enjoyed at the right hand of God. Stephen prayed that Jesus might *receive* his spirit, *i. e.*, might take it to dwell with himself.

"To-day," said Jesus to the penitent thief, "shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Jesus commended his own spirit into the hands of his Father, and promised that his fellow-sufferer should be with him that day in Paradise. The hands of his Father, and Paradise, are therefore the same. Paradise here is a locality, not a condition. For to enjoy the sensible presence of the Saviour and the assurance of his love, does not constitute Paradise. It is evident from the promise that the Saviour does not consider himself as being in Paradise when he was on the cross, or that the thief was then there, though he was with Christ, and had been forgiven.

Paradise is the same as the third heaven. It is said that the Rabbins had two Paradises, one lower than the other, and that the lower paradise they sometimes called "*The*

*bosom of Abraham*—that into this lower Paradise pious souls enter immediately after death; but into the higher Paradise, which is identical with the third heaven, they do not enter till after the resurrection. Be that as it may; it is certain that the doctrine receives no countenance from the New Testament. We can perceive no reason to think that Paul speaks of being carried away at two different times in 2 Cor. 12:1-5. His giving the date indicates clearly that he refers throughout to the same event, and that the *third heaven* in verse 2, is precisely the same as Paradise in verse 4. The penitent thief was, therefore, with Jesus in the third heaven, on the very day they both died. Was this a special favor granted to the penitent thief, but denied to pious souls generally?

“To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of my God.” Rev. 2:7. There is an allusion here to the garden of Eden. The tree of life grew there, and while man remained in the garden he might eat of it. Here it is promised to those who remain faithful unto the end, that they shall enter into Paradise and eat of the tree of life—*i. e.*, enjoy the highest blessedness there. Though it is not said expressly, yet it is clearly implied, that the reward promised will be granted as soon as the victory is achieved. That such is the meaning is made abundantly manifest by the promise of the Saviour to the thief.

The fact that the tree of life grows in the midst of the Paradise of God, identifies Paradise with the New Jerusalem. For, as in the midst of Paradise, so in the midst of the street of the city, on both sides of the river, grows the tree of life. Rev. 22:2. There is no room to doubt that the *New Jerusalem* is the final state of blessedness. It is described as subsequent to the resurrection and the last judgment. Yet it is the very place where pious souls enter at death.

The New Jerusalem is, we think, the very same as Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. Heb. 12:22-24. In the heavenly Jerusalem are the myriads of holy beings, the joyful assembly of angels, the church of the first-born, God the judge of all, the spirits of just men made perfect, and Jesus the Mediator of the new dispensation. There in the highest blessedness with the Father and the Saviour, and the holy angels, are the spirits of the just, redeemed from all evil, having completed their probation and arrived at the final state of glory. While on earth they counted themselves strangers and sought a heavenly country; wherefore God was not ashamed to be called their God, and he prepared for



them a city. Heb. 11 : 16. The Captain of our Salvation is leading many sons into glory. Heb. 2 : 10.

Jesus is in the greatest glory and blessedness, and the pious who have finished their course are with him. While on earth, he earnestly prayed that they might be permitted to be with him. John 17 : 24. He promised before he left them that he would speedily return and conduct them into the house of his Father, that they might be with him. He went before them to prepare a place for them. We do not suppose that he went to create or garnish a place. We understand the statement morally. There was abundance of room in the house of his Father, but there was no room at all in heaven, or in the heart of the Father, or in that of the holy angels, for guilty men. Jesus said that he was going to prepare a place for them, and he went alone through Gethsemane, Pilate's judgment hall, Calvary, Joseph's tomb, and then through his own blood entered heaven itself, and confessed their names before the Father and before the holy angels. There was then room in heaven for guilty men. Jesus came again, not indeed in the clouds of heaven, nor in the death of his disciples, but in the plentiful manifestation of his saving power, and ever since he has been in the church, taking his disciples from guilt and ignorance, through the paths of wisdom and obedience, into his Father's house to be in his own sensible and glorious presence. Hence, Paul expected that he should be with Christ immediately after death. John saw multitudes with Jesus in glory. Jesus will come with an innumerable company of them on the last day. Jude 14 : 1. 1 Thess. 4 : 14.

While so much is plain and certain, yet in other respects the subject is involved in very great, and even painful darkness. All that we know is that the spirits of the just made perfect are in the most glorious blessedness with Jesus. This is, indeed, quite enough for faith and hope. Where heaven is, we know not. Of the condition of departed spirits we can form no idea. The Bible gives us no information as to the mode of their existence and of their felicity. All that we know of spirit is derived from consciousness and from its manifestation through, and in connection with, the body. At death the body is laid aside, and there is to be at the close of the present dispensation, a resurrection of the body. Is the spirit to be, in the meanwhile, wholly without a body? If so, it is impossible for us to form any idea of its condition. Without physical organs, has it any cognizance of other beings? can it communicate with them? can it speak, or hear? can it feel, or be felt? has it power of locomotion?

Are its faculties, in a disembodied state, equal to what they are here; or are they weaker, or more highly developed? We might multiply such questions without end, but we can find no sure answer.

Of the resurrection, as it is generally understood, we can form no clear conception; for we know of nothing analogous. There is no example of life clothing itself from without, as we put on garments. Growth ever proceeds from an inward energy. The vital power works up the food, and uses it according to its own exigency. The change in the caterpillar bears no resemblance to the resurrection. No part of the worm that had wholly lost its vitality enters into the composition of the butterfly.

Reasoning from analogy, we cannot say that the intellectual and moral faculties will be far more expanded in the intermediate state than they are now. Neither the race nor individuals are constantly advancing in this world. In individuals, from a certain point, there is a gradual decay. The last ten years of the octogenarian are not equal to the previous ten.

Indeed, death, including this previous decay and sickness, and the imperfect life in the intermediate state, are not in harmony with the ever-onward advance of the works of God. They have the appearance of a violent breaking in upon the Divine order, and they cannot be accounted for except on the supposition that sin has disturbed the original arrangement. Was this the thing intended of old, when a dwelling became leprous, the stones, in which the plague was, had to be taken and cast into an unclean place, just as a corpse is cast into a sepulchre?

But appearances and analogies should not be pressed too far. We should hold fast to the assurance that for the pious it is better to be absent from the body and be present with Christ. We may also derive no slight encouragement from our Saviour's reply to the Sadducees. Luke 20:27-38. He applied the term resurrection to the intermediate state, and said that those who shall be counted worthy of that world are equal to the angels. Still we cannot hide from ourselves the remarkable fact, that the disciples, in their great privations, sufferings and constant exposure to death, comforted themselves but exceedingly seldom with the anticipation of the joys into which they expected to enter immediately after death. They dwelt almost exclusively on the perfected happiness which they should enjoy after the last judgment.

However this circumstance may be accounted for, we are not, as we have abundantly seen, warranted to infer from it

that they did not expect to be more happy immediately after death than they could be in this world. It may have been quite impossible to convey to men in the flesh any intelligible notion of the state of the spirit between death and the resurrection. On this account but little was revealed respecting it that could deeply impress the imagination and the heart. Besides this, the revelation of the future blessedness of the righteous partakes of the nature of prophecy, and may, therefore, have been subject to a similar law. To the view of the seer, the various steps by which any future event would be accomplished—as for example, the fall of Babylon—would appear blended into one grand catastrophe. The prophet passed in almost total silence over the preliminary stages. For a like reason, the Saviour and the apostles and prophets of the New Testament may have given but little space to the imperfect glory and blessedness of the intermediate state, and fixed their attention and their hope on the complete manifestation of the kingdom of God.

---

ART. V.—THE OLD TESTAMENT JUDGED  
BY THE NEW.

WHAT were the views and feelings of the Saviour and of the New Testament writers respecting the character, design and worth of the Old Testament Scriptures? Deeming this to be an important question, especially for our times, we have taken some pains to collect and arrange their testimony on these points, a part of which we hope to present in the following pages.

And here, at the outset, a few words may be appropriate respecting the Canon of the Old Testament Scripture at the time of Christ, as also its divisions and their technical names.

It is a generally conceded fact, and one which, from the book of "the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach," (chapters 44-49, with the Prologue,) from the Septuagint version, and from the writings of Philo, Josephus and the New Testament, is abundantly capable of demonstration, that the Old Testament Canon in the time of Christ and the apostles, was essentially, if not entirely, the same as it is now. This fact is of



great importance for the successful prosecution of our investigations. From it we learn especially that whatever grounds of difficulty and doubt present themselves to our minds in the study of the Old Testament, the very same existed, with perhaps trifling exceptions, at the time of Christ, and if of a striking and serious character, they must have been known and felt by those who were accustomed to *search* the Old Testament Scriptures.

In the Preface to "the Wisdom of Jesus," which was written not later than B. C. 130, and according to some much earlier, we find a three-fold division of the Old Testament Scriptures, which also, in a more definite form, reappears in the New Testament, to wit: "the law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms." Luke 24:44. The third division of the Old Testament Canon was designated by the term "Psalms," probably because of its generally poetic character, or because the Psalms constituted its principal book, and was regarded as specially important in a Messianic point of view. This triplex division is also found in the contemporary writings of Philo and Josephus, both of whom, however, substitute the word "hymns" for "psalms," while the full designation employed by the latter, is "hymns to God, and maxims of life for men." The Talmudic division, "the law, the prophets, and the writings," or Scriptures, is familiar to every student of the Hebrew. This fuller form of designation was naturally abridged in common use, and hence "the law" as the first and most important part of the canon, came to designate the Old Testament Scriptures collectively; compare John 10:34, 12:34, 15:25, and 1st Cor. 14:21, where the references are not to the Pentateuch but to the Psalms, and in the latter instance to Isaiah. In a similar way, the "Gospel" with us stands for the entire New Testament Scriptures.

In the same sense also occur the expressions, "the law and the prophets," Matt. 5:17, 22:40; or, "Moses and the prophets," Luke 16:29, 31; and the "prophets" alone, Luke 24:25, Acts 13:27. But by far the most frequent designation of the Old Testament are the terms, "Scripture" and "Scriptures," which, perhaps, in every instance of their occurrence, refer to the Old Testament. And here we would remark that the so frequent use in the New Testament of the terms "Scripture," or Scriptures," and "all the Scriptures," (Luke 24:27,) shows that the canon of the Old Testament was definitely fixed and settled, and that each and all of its parts were regarded as forming *one whole* or an essential unity.

Passing now to consider the testimony of Christ and the

apostles respecting the Old Testament, we learn that they regarded the Old Testament Scriptures as the gift of God through the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

We first notice the expression, "word of God," so far as it relates to the Old Testament. Among Christians generally, this is a frequent designation of the inspired Scriptures as a whole, but according to New Testament usage, it seems rather to denote the *divine doctrine* of the Scriptures. It is sometimes, however, used more specifically, as by our Saviour in John 10 : 35, Mark 7 : 13, to denote some special message or command to which reference is made. Hence, in Mark 7 : 9, 13, Matt. 15 : 3, 6, it is used interchangeably with the "commandment of God." More applicable to the Old Testament regarded as a whole, is the phrase, "the oracles of God." Rom. 3 : 2. (1st Pet. 4 : 11.) In these passages it appears to be equivalent to the *divine revelation*, and may properly designate the entire Old Testament Scriptures.\*

We further notice that the New Testament writers, when citing texts and passages from the Old Testament, very frequently represent *God* as speaking, promising, showing, commanding, and the like, and this too where the words cited seem to be those of the prophet himself—thus showing that God spake *through* or *by* the prophets, as is expressly declared in Heb. 1 : 1; Luke 1 : 70; Acts 3 : 18, 21; Rom. 1 : 2. God spake by the mouth of his servant David, Acts 4 : 25. So also He speaks in David, Heb. 5 : 7; and in Hosea, Rom. 9 : 25; *i. e.*, in their writings, or perhaps (Hebraistically) *by* those persons. Hence, too, the formula in Matthew, "that which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet." In all these instances the prophets are represented as the organs through which God has communicated with men.

In regard to the *inspiration* of the Old Testament Scriptures, the apostle Paul (2 Tim. 3 : 16) affirms that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," or by a more exact rendering, "Every Scripture being inspired of God, is also profitable," &c. The idea is the same in either case. Peter asserts that the prophecy of the Scripture came not by the (mere) will of man, but that holy men of God (not visionary fanatics) spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. 2 Peter 1 : 21. The spirit of Christ was in the prophets. 1 Peter 1 : 11, and they spake in the spirit and in the Holy Ghost, as is affirmed, *e. g.*, of David, Matt. 22 : 43; Mark 12 : 36.\* The Holy Ghost spake by Esaias the prophet,

---

\* The passage in Matthew should be explained by that in Mark, on the principle, *pauciora exponi debent per plura*.

Acts 28 : 25, and predicted by the mouth of David, Acts 1 : 16.\* Compare also the frequent formula : the Holy Ghost saith, Heb. 3 : 7, 10 : 15, *etc.* Furthermore, as the Old Testament Scriptures are inspired of God, so the term Scripture is used synonymously with *God*, and is represented as foreseeing, &c. Rom. 9 : 17 ; Gal. 3 : 8, 22. Thus, from the testimony already adduced, we may justly conclude that the Saviour and the apostles regarded the Old Testament Scriptures as *the inspired word of God*.†

The fact of the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures, furnishes the basis for the character and worth which are assigned to them in the New Testament. Thus, from their inspiration, they are termed "holy," Rom. 1 : 2, and from the reverence due to them, they are called "sacred," 2 Tim. 3 : 15, which latter is a frequent epithet in Philo and Josephus. By our Saviour, they are expressly distinguished from the traditions and commandments of men, Matt. 15 : 3-9, Mark 7 : 7-13, and are declared to be as imperishable as the heavens, Matt. 5 : 17. He averred, moreover, that their fulfillment was the object of his coming. The Scripture accounts of the Old Testament are everywhere referred to as authentic, and its predictions as those which *must* be accomplished. Peter speaks of them as the more sure word of prophecy, and as a light shining in a dark place. To say nothing of numberless allusions, it is expressly cited more than four hundred times in the New Testament.‡ It is also a noteworthy fact, that our Saviour has made reference to most of those accounts in the Old Testament, which to sceptical minds, would appear the most legendary, *e. g.*, the creation of the first human *pair*, Matt. 19 : 3 ; the murder of Abel, Matt. 23 : 35 ; the fate of Lot's wife, Luke 17 : 32 ; the

---

\* Dr. J. G. Palfrey, in his recent work entitled, "The Relation between Judaism and Christianity," paraphrases this clause as follows : The spirit of holy indignation in David's heart gave itself utterance, &c. ! Verily, it would seem that some even among us "have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."

† Much confusion and error have arisen, we apprehend, from confounding two different things, namely, inspiration and revelation. The Old Testament writers have largely recorded well known facts of general, local and individual history, as also their own (sometimes wicked) deeds and thoughts. *All* these, surely, need not to have been *revealed* to them from heaven, though of many things they must of course, have been supernaturally informed. From the Apostle Peter, we learn that they spake as they were *moved* by the Holy Ghost. Hence, we may suppose that they were *incited* or *influenced* by the Spirit, to place these facts upon record, not always for our admiration or imitation, but for the instruction and admonition of all who should come after them.

‡ See Olshausen on the Gospels, vol. i., p. 122. The books of the Old Testament, not cited from, are, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Songs. Two or three of the minor prophets, also are not referred to, but these seem to have been regarded as one *book*.



destruction of Sodom, Luke 17 : 29; Noah and the flood, Luke 17 : 27; the manna in the desert, John 6 : 49; the brazen serpent, John 3 : 14; Elijah and the widow of Zarephath, Elisha and Naaman, Luke 4 : 26, 27; the swallowing of Jonah by the great fish, Matt. 12 : 40; the repentance of the Ninevites, Matt. 12 : 41, *etc.* But here the query may arise whether one, for the sake of illustration, might not refer to the Old Testament narratives, as we do to those of the Greek and Roman mythology, without making himself responsible for their truth? Doubtless one *might* do so, but whether the Saviour and his apostles *did* so, is another question. The mere fact of quotation in itself, decides nothing as to the inspiration of the writer quoted. It is the *manner* of quotation and reference in the New Testament which argues the divine authenticity of the Old. The apostles and writers of the New Testament were too ingenuous and too earnest to have much to do with fables and myths, and least of all, to make of them a text-book of inspired authority.

But to return from our digression. The apostle Paul asserts his belief of all things written in the law and the prophets, Acts 24 : 14, and the Saviour upbraids the disciples for their slowness of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken, Luke 24 : 25.\* The apostle of the Gentiles affirms that among the many advantages enjoyed by the Jews, the greatest of all was their being intrusted with the divine oracles of the Old Testament. Rom. 3 : 2. They are able, he adds, to make wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus, 2 Tim. 3 : 15, and were written for our instruction and admonition, Rom. 15 : 4, 1 Cor. 10 : 11, and are profitable for doctrine, for conviction, for correction and

---

\* In Dr. Palfrey's work, to which allusion has been made, we have the astounding intelligence, that with the exception of dim intimations, granted to Abraham, and his sons, the only prediction of the Messiah in the Old Testament is that given by Moses, in Deut. 18 : 15; that subsequent prophets and writers have given us only their own visionary and mostly erroneous fancies and conjectures on this subject, so that as a natural consequence, the disciples of Jesus could not possibly understand how he who had been put to death, could be the promised Messiah, until he had assured them that the prophets "were not authoritative guides," and that their teachings on this point, were mainly a mass of error. Thus, in our author's explanation of Luke 24 : 46, we have this remarkable antithesis of Jesus against the prophets, "The sufferings of Christ were fit, (*ἔδει*,) notwithstanding what was there written. 'Thus,' on the one hand, says Jesus, 'it is written,' 'yet thus,' on the other hand, it was and is fit for the fulfillment of God's high purposes, that the Christ should suffer and die." Page 165. And this, too, we are told, was the method in which the apostles and evangelists reasoned out of the Scriptures, showing and proving by them that Jesus is the Christ! We submit, with all seriousness, whether on Dr. Palfrey's ground, the 25th verse should not be amended by the omission of the words, "and slow of heart," so as to read, "O fools to believe all that the prophets have spoken."

for instruction in righteousness. Hence, to these words of prophecy, as another apostle observes, we do well that we take heed. 2 Peter 1 : 19, 3 : 2. Ignorance of the Old Testament Scriptures is declared by our Saviour to be a source of error in things of greatest importance, Matt. 22 : 29, (Acts 13 : 27,) and one's belief in the writing of Moses is most intimately connected by him with belief in his own words, John 5 : 47. He must also have seen a *sufficiency* in the law and the prophets, or he never could have put into the mouth of Abraham such words as are found in Luke 16 : 29-31.

As to the *morality* of the Old Testament, we have the Saviour's authority for believing that to love God supremely and our neighbors as ourselves, is the sum and substance of the teachings of the Old Testament, Matt. 22 : 37-40, and this certainly is neither a barbarous nor a bad morality. This sentiment of our Lord's is also frequently echoed by his inspired apostles. Rom. 13 : 8-10; Gal. 5 : 14; James 2 : 8. We may further add that these two commandments, with a third, Be ye holy for I am holy, all taken from the Old Testament, formed the sum and substance of our Saviour's teachings. As supreme love to God is required in the Old Testament, it is evident that He must be represented therein as a God of love. And assuredly, we can nowhere find more affecting descriptions of the tender mercies of Jehovah, His goodness to all, His long forbearance, His fatherly compassion, His regard for the poor and the needy, than can be found in the Old Testament Scriptures. And hence, the greater part of the *devotional* theology of the Christian church in all ages has been drawn from the Old Testament, and particularly from the book of Psalms. But some of these Psalms, it is said, and even those termed Messianic, are vindictive in their spirit. If David, however, be the author of these Psalms, *e. g.*, 69 : 21-28, 109 : 6-20, it is but fair that the psalmist's words should be judged by his deeds, and certainly his actions, when his position is considered, do not prove him to have been a man of revengeful spirit. Especially must it be remembered that the enemies of the psalmist were still more the enemies of Jehovah, and also that God, by His Holy Spirit, spake by the mouth of his servant David, so that these "imprecations" are more properly to be regarded as *Jehovah's denunciations and purposes against sin and the sinner*; see Rom. 11 : 9. At least, we must not look upon the psalmist as thirsting for personal revenge, but as desiring a recompense from Jehovah against the enemies of God and

all goodness, and this too, not for a selfish end, but through regard for God and His violated law.

But many of the Old Testament saints, it is averred, were men eminent for their wickedness. But who are these "saints?" Have we by a sort of Rabbinic or Popish conceit, canonized in our minds, all the more important personages of the Old Testament? Certainly, they are not set forth as saints in the Old Testament, nor are they called such indiscriminately, in the New. The prophets, indeed, are in the New Testament often termed "holy," and our Saviour speaks of them and of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as inheritors of the kingdom of God. Luke 13 : 38. But nowhere are even these held forth as faultless patterns of morality, though they are justly deemed worthy of imitation. James 5 : 10. Jesus alone is represented as "without sin."

Passing by, for the present, the consideration of the character of the Mosaic legislation in point of morality, we would here notice an objection which is supposed to invalidate much of our argumentation, namely, that Christ and the apostles did not come into the world to instruct the Jews in criticism, or to correct all their speculative errors. To this Witsius long since well replied, "*Fuerunt tamen doctores veritatis (if not of criticism) neque passi sunt sibi per communem ignorantiam aut procerum astum imponi. Non certe in mundum venere ut vulgares errores foverent, suaque auctoritate munirent, nec per Judæos solum sed et populos unice a se pendentes longe lateque spargerent.*"

The above objection, as the reader will easily perceive, justly takes it for granted, that the Jews, in the time of Christ, were fully persuaded of the inspiration and divine authenticity of their Scriptures, but that the Saviour and his apostles did not combat their *mistaken* notions on this point, through fear of arousing their prejudices, or because their error was deemed of slight importance. And this is said of him whose name is *truth*, John 14 : 6, and in whose mouth was found *no guile*! No one, however, who reads Matthew 24, will imagine that the Saviour's carefulness to avoid the opposition of the Pharisees, prevented him from telling them the truth, and from Matt. 15 : 3-6, Mark 7 : 3-13, we may learn how severely he distinguished between the word and commandment of God, and the traditions and commandments of men, and how sternly he upbraided the Scribes and Pharisees for their making the latter to supplant and annul the former. Nor do the apostles show any greater regard, than did their divine teacher, for Jewish myths and the traditions,



commandments and doctrines of men. Titus 1 : 4; 1 Tim. 1 : 4, 4 : 7; 2 Tim. 4 : 4; Col. 2 : 8, 20, 22.

There is, however, another aspect and representation of the Old Testament, than that which we have given, and to this we must now attend. In the ancient Jewish dispensation there is that which in the New Testament is pronounced imperfect, weak and unprofitable, and which has been abrogated by Christ. It would appear, moreover, that our Saviour in some instances, combated the teachings of Moses, and in opposition to them, laid down other precepts milder and more *Christian* in their character. It is furthermore argued, that since the old covenant is abolished and since Christ for us is the way, the truth and the life, we are not only no longer under the law of Moses, but are not bound even by the precepts of Old Testament morality.

In reference to this whole subject, we must steadily keep in view the difference of *design* in the Jewish and in the Christian dispensations. The Mosaic legislation was political as well as religious, that of Christ was moral. The former legislated for a nation just freed from bondage and heathenism, the latter for the *individual, Christian* conscience. The one legislated for Judea, the other for the whole world, and for all time. The legislation of Moses was *professedly*, preparatory to a better covenant and to a new, spiritual and everlasting kingdom. Hence, the first covenant was not *absolutely* perfect, but it was the same Jehovah who made it, that found fault with it and displaced it by a better. Heb. 8 : 8. Christ was made under the (Mosaic) law, Gal. 4 : 4, and rendered to it perfect obedience. But having fulfilled it by his sufferings and death, he has for us abolished in his flesh, the *law of commandments contained in ordinances; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.* Eph. 2 : 15; Col. 2 : 14. Hence, it is the meats and drinks and diverse washings, and carnal ordinances, limited in part by their own nature to the inhabitants of Palestine, and imposed on them only until the time of reformation, Heb. 9 : 10, which are abolished by the cross, and not the moral precepts of the law, which from *their* own nature, are universal and imperishable, and the least of which one may not abrogate with impunity. It is the tithes of mint, anise, and cummin, and not the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and faith, (*such* matters Christ finds in the law!) which are taken out of the way. Were all the descriptions of God's holy character and attributes, all the righteous precepts and all the promises and consolations of

the Old Testament to become obsolete and void, this surely were a sad thing for the hopes of pious men.

As to the alleged hostile attitude of Moses and Jesus, we would remark that the Saviour in the Sermon on the Mount, does not place himself in any *personal* antagonism with the Hebrew lawgiver,—does not say as, in some instance perhaps, he might have said: Moses commanded the fathers thus and so, but I say unto you. See Matt. 19 : 8, 9. Instead of this we have the periphrastic formula, *Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time*; from which we may infer that our Saviour combated not so much the teachings of Moses, as the interpretation and application of them, which the multitude had *heard* from the lips of those who sat in Moses' seat.\* This is especially evident from Matt. 5 : 43, where we plainly find a Pharisaic gloss. It would seem that certain teachers of the law, by making the word *neighbor* synonymous with *friend*, and falsely inferring thence the justifiableness of hating one's enemies, had promulgated a sentiment which is nowhere countenanced in the Old Testament Scriptures.† For by their law the Jews were required to love not only their neighbors, but even strangers as themselves. Lev. 19 : 34. And though the precise words, *Thou shalt love thine enemies*, are not found in the Old Testament, yet the Israelite *was* commanded if he saw his enemy's ox or ass fallen down and lying under their burdens, or going astray, to help them and bring them back to their owner, (Ex. 23 : 4, 5;) and this certainly was showing kindness to an enemy. The injunction of an apostle, *Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst, give him drink, &c.*, has truly a *Christian* sound, but is nevertheless taken word for word from the Old Testament. See Prov. 25 : 21 (Sept. version;) compare also Prov. 24 : 17; Job 31 : 29.

In our Saviour's comments on other of the Mosaic precepts, *e. g.*, verses 21, 27, it was evidently his design to unfold the *spirit* and *true intent* of those precepts, and this indeed seems to have been one important method by which Christ *fulfilled* the law.

And in the matter of retaliation, verse 38, *et seq.*, we may still suppose that our Saviour's animadversions were chiefly directed against the wrong application of the Mosaic precept.

---

\* The rendering, *by them of old time*, would be still more favorable to this view, and is adopted purely for *linguistic* reasons, by some of the most distinguished biblical scholars.

† Not all the Pharisees favored the above sentiment, for Josephus more than once declares that according to the Jewish Law even enemies were to be kindly treated and were not to be despoiled.

Certainly Christ does not deny the propriety of it at the time when and for the people to whom it was given. But he probably does deny that the *lex talionis* should be taken from the hands of the magistracy, into the individual's own hands, and thus converted into an instrument of private personal revenge. Perhaps, however, the law should not be taken in a strict literal construction, for there is no evidence that it was ever enforced in its literal form. The injured party may not have been obliged by it to seek retaliation in its strictest manner. He may have been left free to forgive the injurer or to accept a *pecuniary compensation*. According to this view, which is confirmed by the testimony of Josephus, (*Antiq.*, 4, 8, 35,) to give "eye for eye" would be to give the injured person, that (pecuniary) satisfaction which an eye is judged to be worth. Certain at least it is, that revenge is no more inculcated in the Old Testament than hatred, for it declares that vengeance belongeth not to man but to God. Deut. 32 : 35; compare also with the passages above cited, Lev. 19 : 18; Pro. 20 : 22; 24 : 29; Ps. 94 : 1.

We deem it possible, however, that Christ would object to some of the Mosaic regulations and precepts, as not accordant with *absolute* truth and right. As he said of divorce, so he might perhaps have said of polygamy, slavery,\* and other customs which the Hebrew lawgiver did not *directly* prohibit, but sought rather to mitigate their evils: Moses *suffered* these things because of the hardness of your hearts, but from the beginning *it was not so*. Matt. 19 : 8. We would not deny the difference in character of the Mosaic polity, and of the Christian dispensation—a difference which is founded on their different designs. We hold that the groundwork of morality in the Old and New Testaments is essentially one and the same, while the manifestations of it, are in a measure and necessarily diverse. In the Old Testament God's justice as regards the wicked is made the more prominent. While his mercy towards them has the greater prominence in the New. The object of Christ in his *first* coming was not to destroy but to save. Hence he would not, with Elijah, call down fire from heaven to consume his enemies. Luke 9 : 54-6. Keeping this difference of design in view, we can

---

\* We conceive that no greater injustice could be heaped upon Moses and his legislation than to degrade the system of servitude, which he tolerated, to a level with our more modern and consummate systems of oppression. Yet if we allow their substantial identity, it does not follow that *we* should countenance the system, much less that we should *harden our hearts*, in order to its continuance under the light of the gospel. Similar remarks also are applicable to the "patriarchal institution" of polygamy.



easily perceive how the Saviour could regard the Jewish dispensation as divine, and yet object to the *transference* of some of the *political* and *ritual* precepts of Moses, into the new *spiritual* kingdom, which he came to establish. Our Saviour does by no means deny "the divine legation of Moses," nor does he indiscriminately reject the statutes of his polity. On the contrary he commanded the multitude, and even his own disciples, to observe and do whatsoever the Scribes and Pharisees bade them, simply because they sat in Moses' seat. Matt. 23 : 2, 3. In controversy also with one of their national enemies, he boldly affirmed that "salvation is of the Jews," thus recognizing the *divine scheme* of the Old Covenant. And everywhere in the New Testament we may observe this remarkable fact, that the Saviour and the apostles, while laboring to subvert the Mosaic polity, yet constantly recognize its divine origin; nor did our Lord seek to *destroy* until, and only as he had first *fulfilled*.

It was therefore in accordance with the divine will that Moses accommodated his legislation to the circumstances of his people, and had regard in a measure even to the hardness of their hearts. But in doing this he nevertheless established a code under whose influence the entire body of the people, as Josephus remarks, were prepared for religion, and the evils suffered at first were at length fully eradicated. Nor should we in this connection unjustly overlook the real humanity, gentleness and kindness which everywhere *pervade* the Mosaic legislation, and which will forever distinguish it from all the legislations of man.\*

We have thus presented, with as much fairness as we were able, *one* branch of inspired Christian testimony respecting the character and worth of the Old Testament Scriptures. From what has been already adduced, it is evident that the Saviour and the apostles perfectly agree in their testimony, so that nothing can be gained by attempting to distinguish between them. And now, what to the Christian, is the value of their testimony? Says Professor Stuart, in his "History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon:" "If it can be shown that Christ and the apostles as the commissioned messengers of God to establish Christianity, did receive,

---

\* For passages in which kindness is inculcated towards the *poor and needy*, see Ex. 22 : 22-7; 23 : 11; Lev. 19 : 9, 10, 14, 15, 34; 5 : 7, 11; 12 : 8; 14 : 21; 25 : 10, 35; Deut. 1 : 17; 10 : 18, 19; 15 : 7-11; 16 : 11, 14; 26 : 12, 13; 27 : 19; 24 : 6, 10-22,—towards *servants*, Ex. 21 : 16, 20, 26, 27; Lev. 25 : 10, 39, *sq.*; Deut. 5 : 14; 15 : 12-15; 16 : 11-16; 23 : 15, 16; 24 : 14, 15,—towards *animals*, Ex. 23 : 5, 12, 19; Lev. 22 : 28; 25 : 7; Deut. 25 : 4; 22 : 6, 7, 10, &c. Such are some of the *Amenities* of Mosaism.

regard and treat the Scriptures of the Jews as obligatory and of divine authority, and also that these Scriptures were the same books which belong to our present Old Testament, then two consequences must follow from the establishment of these propositions. The first is, that whatever doubts or difficulties any one may have about the critical history or origin of particular books in the Old Testament, still he must now acknowledge that they have received the sanction of an authority from which there is no appeal. Universal skepticism alone can make exceptions to them, on the ground of credibility and authenticity. The second is, that the man who admits the divine origin and authority of the Christian religion, and that the New Testament contains a credible and authentic account or development of it by Christ and by the apostles, must be altogether inconsistent with himself and inconsequent in his reasonings, if he rejects the divine origin and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures."

This reasoning seems to us sound and conclusive; and from the testimony now presented, must we not regard the above premises as established, and the resulting inferences as incontrovertible? It has long been our firm conviction, that there is no dissevering the Old Testament from the New. There is too much of each in the other,\* the former has had too great an influence on the character of the latter to allow of any separation. The New Testament, in its idiom, style and thought, is moulded throughout under Old Testament influence, so that scarcely a verse or a clause can be fully understood and appreciated apart from the Old Testament. God has joined them together, and what He has thus joined, man may not and cannot put asunder. They form *one* foundation for God's spiritual temple; for though we as Christians rest our faith and hopes, and our whole souls, upon Christ as the chief corner-stone, yet we are also built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets—the divine doctrine and teachings of the Old and New Testaments. Eph. 2:20.† "Wouldst thou see," said Origen, "that Moses is ever with Jesus, the law with the Gospel? Let the Gospel itself teach thee: for when Jesus was gloriously transfigured, Moses also and Elias appeared with him in glory, that thou mightest

---

\* "Testamentum vetus de Christo exhibendo, Novum de Christo exhibitio agit; Novum in veteri latet, vetus in novo patet." Augustine.

† Some regard these as the New Testament prophets, but for reasons which we deem untenable. That they should be placed *after* the apostles, is natural from the New Testament stand point, while the absence of the article, in this construction, proves nothing against our view. That Paul also could have no doctrinal objection to this view, is evident from such passages as Rom. 1:2; 16:26.

know that the law, the prophets and the gospel always agree in one and abide in one glory." Infidels have been wont, as Dr. Paley asserts, to attack Christianity through the sides of Judaism. Very well: we conceive that Christianity is well defended at that quarter, and we apprehend that its enemies will have to continue their siege for some generations to come. The evidences of the historic truth of the Old Testament are multiplying and strengthening every day, by every new investigation of history, and by every fresh discovery of the earth-buried antiquities of the East, "the hoary cradle of the world." Christianity will receive no serious detriment from her Jewish parentage, nor need she be ashamed of her origin any more than the full-blown flower need be ashamed of its stalk and root. And here we would distinctly state that it is not the purpose of this our appeal to the testimony of Christ and the apostles in behalf of the Old Testament, to cover up any of its difficulties, or to ward off from it the most searching investigation or the severest criticism. There are difficulties in the Old Testament, and they are not a few, but they were all discovered by its friends, and many of them have already been satisfactorily solved. And we may well feel thankful for them, in so far as they have led us to deeper investigations, and to new discoveries in its hidden treasures. Coming as it does from God, and disclosing His mysterious purposes and ways among men from the beginning of time, there are some things in it "hard to be understood." And since it was given in the language of men, and has been conveyed to us in human channels through so many generations, it has, doubtless, suffered, though to a comparatively slight degree, from the touch of man and from the ravages of time. We may, therefore, in our studies of the Old Testament, wisely adopt the rule which the great Augustine proposed for himself. "If at any time I meet with anything in the Scriptures that seems contrary to truth, I believe either that it is an error of the copyist, or that the translator has not caught the sense, or that I myself have not rightly understood it." There still may be difficulties too formidable for our present means of solution, but these, while they may serve a useful purpose in "the trial of our faith," should yet not be suffered so far to disturb and distress our minds as to destroy for us "the comfort of the Scriptures." At any moment of doubt and perplexity, we may securely resort to the testimony of the apostles and the words of Christ.

In any controversy with opposers we may also safely resort to the New Testament and take our stand on its



ground. We would make the same affirmations in behalf of the Old Testament which Christ and the apostles do; we would also make the same concessions which they did, and *no more*, and these we conceive are sufficient to allay the scruples and satisfy the demands of every reasonable and upright mind.

And, finally, in the New Testament we shall find the best directions for the use and application of the Old Testament Scriptures. Here both the rules and the exceptions are clearly laid down for our guidance, and are amply sufficient for Christian practice. The great Apostle declares that the inspired Scriptures of the Old Testament are profitable for doctrine, for conviction, for correction and for instruction in righteousness. For these objects, and for these alone, were they employed by our Saviour and by all the writers of the New Testament, thus leaving us an example that we should *follow* in their steps. And this much is certain, that NO FOLLOWER OF CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES WILL DERIDE, OR DECRY, OR LIGHTLY ESTEEM THE SCRIPTURES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

---

#### ART. VI.—A SEARCH FOR THE CHURCH.

WHAT is the Church; is at present a question of more than ordinary significance. Is it the house in which Christian worship is conducted; or is it the worshippers? If the latter, what is its extent? Are all Christians included, or does its ample meaning embrace all saints, of all ages? Or is it limited to all the Christians in a nation, a province, a diocese, or city? Or is it restricted to the body of clergy, or ecclesiastics, or sacred rulers, in distinction from the laity? Has the word *church* literal and figurative meanings? If so, is the literal meaning specific, and definite? Can it be clearly ascertained? And by what means can it be ascertained?

Near two chiliads of the Christian era have passed away, yet the answers to this grave inquiry are diverse as the dialects of Babel. What, and where is the Church? Is it an organized, continuous corporation, and is a visible and historical succession of members and officers essential to its valid existence? What is the sin of schism? These, and

kindred questions are exciting unwonted attention. Every attempt to write a history of Christianity, illustrates the great desirableness, and perhaps the difficulty, of answering these inquiries satisfactorily. Every writer has been nurtured and developed within the pale of some one of the numerous bodies which claims to itself the name and prerogatives of the church; all his early biases, and most sacred associations cluster around that cultus, as the Church of Christ. His first views of the church being taken from the stand-point of his early faith, will give direction to all his subsequent inquiries.

The methods proposed for finding the answer to the question, "What is the Church," are quite numerous; but they may all be substantially resolved into two: the Scriptural and the traditional or historical. The first method assumes, as its starting point, that all we know, or can know, of the Church, must be derived from the Scriptures. Its origin, its nature, its design, its essential elements, its organism, its ministries, its symbols, its mysteries, its powers and functions, its life, the principle of its perpetuity, and the law of its propagation, must all, according to this method, be found in the Scriptures. This method allows us to derive all possible aid from history, experience, and common sense, in ascertaining the true scope and meaning of the Scriptures, yet makes them the only authority. The other method starts with the assumption, that history and tradition, connecting us by a visible succession with "the Church of the first ages," is the criterion by which to answer the question. The advocates of this method would treat the Inspired Record with different degrees of respect, but all agree in placing history and tradition far before it, in answering this question.

This latter method is uniformly adopted by Romanist writers; and, though inconsistent with their professed principles, by many in the Protestant communions. It is advocated with much zeal, ability and learning, in the "Mercersburg Review." The number of that work for September, 1852, contains a brief review of Mr. Crowell's "CHURCH MEMBER'S MANUAL," from the pen of the well known Dr. Nevin. He calls the doctrine of that book "Evangelical Radicalism," which, though it is "a truly interesting and suggestive book," yet "not exactly in the way of its own intention." "The author," says Dr. Nevin, "is a Baptist, who proposes and sets forth a scheme of the Church to suit the rationalistic stand-point of his own sect." "The whole appeal must be '*to the Bible*;' which means, of course, to the Bible as read by William Crowell and his Baptist

brethren, in distinction from the sense attached to it by the ancient Fathers of the Catholic Church of all past ages."

An extract from this review will show how difficult it is for a mind like that of Dr. Nevin, to comprehend the nature of the system which he opposes, and his earnestness in opposing it. "The scheme," he says, "is completely at war with what was held to be Christianity in the first ages. Of this its patrons may not feel it necessary to make any account. Enough that they can pretend to have the Bible at all events on their side. Weighed against such authority, of what worth or force is Christian antiquity—even though it *should* reach back to the very age next following that of the Apostles? Still, however, the fact is one which ought to be distinctly seen and acknowledged. Let it pass for what it may, it deserves to be fully understood and held up to view. This Baptist theory of Christianity is not what was held to be the 'mystery of godliness' in the early church. Neither is the difference circumstantial only and accidental. It goes to the heart of religion. It has to do with its universal system. We have in the two cases actually two gospels, two altogether different versions of the Christian salvation. In one case, all rests on the Creed; in the other, this fundamental symbol is charged with heresy and falsehood. In one case, the church is made to be supernatural, and is honored as the real medium of salvation to her children; in the other, she is treated as a 'figment' in every such view, and falls into the conception of a social contract. The ministry in one case holds its commission and its powers from God; in the other case, it is the creature of man. In the one case, the sacraments are seals and bearers of heavenly grace; in the other, they possess no such mystic force whatever. The creed of the ancient church, this modern system openly turns into a lie. What all antiquity believed, it takes a pride in refusing to believe; and affects to be *spiritual*, by treating with contempt the real mystery of the Spirit's presence, in the only form in which it was, to all Christian antiquity, an object of faith. How can two such contrary systems be considered for one moment the same? They exclude each other. If one is to stand, the other must fall. Brought before the tribunal of this modern system, the ancient Christianity is found to be altogether wrong and false. We have only, however, to reverse the procedure, by bringing the modern system to the bar of the ancient, and at once the falsehood and wrong fall just as conclusively over to the other side. The two schemes are completely at issue. The contest between them is one of life and death. When the



modern system challenges our faith, it asks us in fact to renounce all connection with the faith and religious life of the Church of the first ages. And so on the other hand, if we feel it necessary to hold fast to the communion of this primitive piety—if we cannot bear the thought of giving up all spiritual fellowship with the martyrs, confessors, fathers, and saints, of the early ages, and are not willing to set them all down for fanatics and fools—if we tremble to stigmatize the Christianity that conquered the Roman world as the invention of Satan, root and branch—we must not, and dare not, shrink from the responsibility of declaring the rationalistic, unsacramental system now before us, a dangerous delusion, which all who value the salvation of their souls are bound religiously to avoid. It would have been so regarded, beyond all controversy, by the universal church in the beginning. There would have been as little patience with it precisely, as there was with Gnosticism. It would have been branded openly as a virtual denial of the entire mystery of the Gospel. Of this, we say, there can be no doubt, and in regard to it there should be no equivocation or disguise.

“Shall we be told then, that it is harsh to think and speak as we do of the religious system now under consideration, because it embraces a large amount of respectable Christian profession at the present time, and is nothing more, in fact, than the last phase of what is called Orthodox Puritanism, which many hold to be the very perfection and *ne plus ultra* of evangelical religion? We reply by asking, How is it to be helped? We are shut up to a sore dilemma here, from which there is no possible escape. We must break with this modern Puritanic system, or else break with the whole Christianity of the first ages. No sophistry can cause them to appear the same. The Creed of the one is the Lie of the other. What was the mystery of godliness in the old church, this new faith unblushingly declares to be the mystery of iniquity. In such circumstances we have no choice, except to say with which of the two interests we hold it best to make common cause. To justify the one, is necessarily to condemn the other. To show respect towards this new faith, (because it is outwardly respectable,) must cover with reproach and disgrace the old faith from the days of Polycarp and Ignatius, to those of Ambrose and Augustine? Do we owe no respect also, no charity, to the first Christian ages? What is the peculiar merit of this Baptist Puritanism, a thing comparatively of yesterday, that it should be allowed to insult all Christian antiquity, and have full exemption at the same time from every unfavorable judgment upon its

own pretensions and claims? 'What!' we may well say to it in the language of St. Paul, 'Came the word of God out from you; or came unto you only?' Who art thou, upstart system! that thou shouldst set thyself in such proud style above the universal church of antiquity—the immediate successors of the Apostles, the noble army of martyrs, the goodly fellowship of the fathers, the vast cloud of witnesses that look down upon us from those ages of faith—charging it with wholesale superstition and folly, and requiring us to renounce its creed, the whole scheme and habit of its religious life, and to accept from *thy* hands, in place of it, another form of belief, another scheme of doctrine altogether, as infallibly true and right. Who gave thee this authority? Whence came such infallibility?"

Having said so much on this point, Dr. Nevin proceeds to "boldly deny that this Baptist Puritanism has the Bible on its side!" In reading his review, we hardly know whether to pity the writer's inability to represent truly the system which he is opposing, or to smile at the earnestness to which his imagination has wrought him up, in opposing it. The doctrine that man's reason, enlightened by the spirit of God, is his guide to the interpretation of the Scriptures, is denounced as "rationalism." "What more," he exclaims, "could the worst radicalism ask or want!" It is not necessary to point out the manifold misconceptions in the above extract. That the "Baptistic" method of answering the question with which we started, is the opposite of his, no one can doubt.

It is useless to dogmatize, worse than useless to write in the strain of Dr. Nevin, on so grave a question as this. Let us suppose an intelligent, earnest, sincere Christian man, inquiring, "Where and what is the Church?" Let it be supposed that he has read the Scriptures and history attentively, that he has risen above all the ties and biases of sect, that as a wise master-builder, he would comprehend the true idea of the Divine Architecture of "the Church of God, which is the house of the living God." Where must such a mind begin its inquiries? Must he go to any existing body? If so, to which? To Rome? Ten thousand voices answer, "No. Rome is apostate." To her elder sisters; the Greek, or Oriental hierarchies? Rome unites with all Protestantism in thundering, "No." Turn, then, to the Lutheran, the English Episcopal, the Genevan Ecclesiasticisms; and the *noes* are a still greater majority. Come to America, the youngest born of nations, where the spirit of early Christianity breaks

forth in many forms of ecclesiastic culture, repeat the inquiry, and listen to the discordant answers.

Why then, does Dr. Nevin denounce the author of the "*Church Member's Manual*" as "rationalistic," because in seeking the answer to this question "he scorns the thought of taking counsel of the church itself?" If reason is to be silenced when this inquiry is made, whose testimony (among all the bodies claiming to be the Church) is to be believed? Why should Dr. Nevin reason with his readers at all on the question, if reason is to be set aside? He quotes from the preface of the "*Manual*" these expressions: "The Bible is the Church's supreme law, reason is her court. The Bible is the compass; reason, lighted by the Spirit of God, is the binnacle lamp." On this he exclaims, "There we have it. Is not that rationalism almost without disguise? What more could the worst radicalism ask, or want?" Indeed, it is impossible to answer, if reason is to be thus summarily ruled out.

And suppose we carry the question to the bar of "Christian Antiquity," even to "the church of the first ages," as Dr. Nevin insists, what advance have we made, if "reason lighted by the Spirit of God" is to be thus contemned? How can the facts of history be ascertained, or its testimony weighed, without reason? Which is most "rationalistic," to exercise reason on the teachings of human history, or the teachings of the Bible? "If we receive the testimony of man, the testimony of God is greater." Ecclesiastical history can, at the best, only give us a partial conception of the belief of the Christians of other ages on this question, even with the help of reason. And we find the testimonies of history to be as discordant, and mutually destructive, as the responses of the countless organisms all claiming to be the Church.

One source of endless confusion in the writings of the Mercersburg reviewers, is, that they continually confound the spirit of religion with the form, piety with ecclesiasticism, faith with the mere cultus. Baptists claim, no less than others, spiritual relationship with the confessors and martyrs of antiquity; with the high hopes, the triumphant faith, the glowing love of the "noble army" who have shed such unfading lustre on the Christian name. They do not separate themselves from the Christianity of the past. Their theory of the church secures unity, continuity, succession, far more surely than the systems which oppose it. They believe that the spirit of Christianity extends far beyond even its normal forms. The same spirit of faith, in which Enoch walked



with God, Noah condemned the world, Job was perfectly upright, Abraham became the heir of the world, Jacob prevailed with God, Stephen was raised above the fear of death, Polycarp confessed his master—sustained Bunyan in his “den,” Judson in the death prison, and Williams in his banishment. We do not separate ourselves from the piety or the orthodoxy of antiquity, by our theory of the Church. We claim a family relationship to every part of historical Christianity, as children of one Father, redeemed by the same blood, sanctified by the same spirit. But when we ask historical Christianity the question now before us, her responses are so countless, diverse, contradictory, that we can not receive them. Nay, we know of no authority which requires us to receive them. Has God inspired the Mercersburg reviewers, or the Doctors of the Greek, Roman, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed, or any other bodies claiming to be churches, to instruct us respecting the claims of historical Christianity? If historical Christianity were universal, where are her credentials to exercise this lordship over our faith?

The same argument which sends us to the existing church, or to Christian antiquity, for the answer to this question, demands that we receive *all* our doctrines from the same authoritative source. Our doctrine of the church is a point of our faith. “It goes,” says Dr. Nevin, “to the very heart of religion. It has to do with its universal system.” Here, then, is the alternative. We must take our entire Christianity from history, or from the Scriptures. There is no middle ground. For, on our theory, all the light which the history of early Christianity sheds on the meaning, and application of the Scriptures, is to be accepted. We must, therefore, derive all our Christianity from the Bible, or none. When we “search the Scriptures, because we think that in them we have eternal life,” we must search them to find the church, its theory, its nature, its design, its organization, its constituent elements, its discipline, its principle of life and salvation. There is, therefore, no middle ground between this “Baptistic theory,” and the doctrine of Rome. The mighty conflict which is coming on, will be waged between this theory, and that of Rome, whose claim is, that she is the only authorized expounder of Christianity, and administrator of the grace of salvation.

But whence, let us ask, came the *idea* of the church? Was it not from the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, as recorded in the New Testament? Let it be supposed, for a moment that those Divinely Inspired Records were lost, could any one tell when, or how this idea

originated? If there was reason to fear that the true idea was lost, how could it be regained? Where would we find the true church idea, as held by its Founder? We open the record of his words, which fell from his own lips, and find that one of the most sacred Christian duties, one which may come in way of any disciple at any time, is to be done to the *Church*. "If he will not hear thee, tell it to the CHURCH, and if he neglect to hear the CHURCH,"—then the consequences will run through eternity. What did our Blessed Lord mean, by that word, *Church*?" To what, to whom, is this most solemn duty to be performed? Who is charged with this far-reaching decision, extending from earth to Heaven? Has He given us no certain means of knowing? Do you say, He has commanded the Church to tell us what and where is the Church? Produce your warrant. Do you say, He has left this truth to be handed down from generation to generation, by oral or written tradition? Then produce your warrant. Do you say, this is not to be determined by reason? Then cease to address us as reasonable beings; why reason with us at all? If we are to receive the word of something which you call *the Church*, with unquestioning faith, why approach our reason to persuade us that this something is the Church?

But if the idea of the church came from, or has been transmitted by, the recorded words and acts of the Saviour and his Apostles, then the idea is contained in those recorded words. Of their unrecorded words and acts, we know nothing and can know nothing. If we can not find a description of the Church in this record, we can not find it at all. We are shut up to the written word. If the pen of Inspiration has not drawn the plan, and described the materials of the Church of Jesus Christ, then we can never be certain that we have performed the most sacred duties of our holy calling. The epistles of Paul are directed to *churches*, situated in Corinth, in Ephesus, in Philippi, in Colosse, instructing them to perform acts of internal discipline, and of public duty vitally affecting the comfort, the reputation, the dearest personal rights, and the eternal welfare of numbers. When the glorified Saviour would make a revelation from the spirit world, he sent it "to the seven *Churches* which are in Asia." They are addressed as known, existing, responsible bodies, subjects of praise or of blame, charged with a most sacred trust, bound to know and obey his will. These, surely were *churches*; according to the true meaning of the word. They had their defects, as well as their excellencies, but they were *churches*, in the true intent and meaning. "He that hath an ear, let him hear

what the Spirit saith unto THE CHURCHES." These are definite words, and they must relate to definite things. What were they?

The English word, *church*, from the Greek *κυριακον*, *pertaining to the Lord*, or as others think, *house of the Lord*,—the word *house* being often put for *household*,—is used in a great variety of meanings, in our current literature. But no such looseness is found in the original, inspired record. All is uniform, and definite there. The word *κυριακον*, is never used to signify *church*, in the New Testament. The Greek word translated *church* in our English Bible, never means *house*, nor nation, nor province, nor body of ecclesiastics. The usage and application of that word, therefore, must furnish the answer to our inquiry. By a critical examination of every passage in which the word occurs, and a collation of the whole, with the general teaching of the New Testament we may hope to develope the true idea of the church.

The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs in the New Testament one hundred and fifteen times, in its singular and plural forms; in every instance but three, it is translated *church*. Few instances of equal uniformity can be found.\* Its derivation from *ἐκκαλεῖν*, *to call out from*, indicates its meaning. It is purely a Grecian word, both in its derivation and usage. In the democratic cities of ancient Greece the *Ekklesia* consisted of the qualified citizens, summoned together for the transaction of public business. Legislative, and sometimes judicial functions were exercised by the *Ekklesia*, a majority deciding. It held ordinary and extraordinary meetings, the members being summoned by the town-crier. Each member received a stipulated sum for loss of time in attendance. The formation of the *Ekklesia* in the different cities of ancient Greece, terms of membership, powers, and forms of business, were very uniform and definite. It was a select body of qualified citizens, called out from the masses of the people, to deliberate and decide on matters of common public interest.

This word, which had acquired a definite meaning in the most highly cultivated and wide spread language on the earth, was selected by our Lord, to be employed for the purpose of designating the Christian body, the only form of affiliated, organized members of the Gospel brotherhood. It

---

\* The word *συναγωγή*, occurs fifty-six times, and is translated *synagogue* in every case except two, *viz.*, Acts 13 : 43, where it is rendered *congregation*, and James 2 : 2, *assembly*.



was purely of Greek origin; its meaning had grown wholly out of its usage, to represent Grecian ideas and customs. It is a significant fact, that while the Messianic dispensation, foretold by the Prophets, ushered in just as the scepter was departing from Judah, is spoken of under the Hebraistic figure of "the kingdom of Heaven," while Jesus was hailed at his birth, and satirized on his cross, as "the king of the Jews," yet the word, and the only word used to designate the polity of his kingdom, is not of Hebrew but Grecian origin; derived not from kingly, but from democratic forms of government. This is the more remarkable, from the fact, that his disciples were all Israelites. His *Ekklesia* must be composed of Israelites. Yet he rejected all Hebrew words, descriptive of forms of polity derived from Abrahamic, or Mosaic customs, and institutions, and adopted a word invented and used hitherto by heathens, as the archetype of his kingdom.

If, therefore, we would know what the Church is,—what it was designed to be, and ought to be through all time,—we must study this archetype, chosen by Him who is "Head over all things to the church which is his body." The *Ekklesia* had its definite number of enrolled and qualified members. All had a part in its proceedings. There could be no infants in the *Ekklesia*. Weighty matters were considered and decided, in which every member had a voice. It was a local assembly; all its members met in one place for consultation; it elected its own officers, received or expelled members, by vote, sat in judgment on offenders, and its decisions were final. Such was the Grecian model of the object of our inquiry.

The word *ἐκκλησία* did not pass by one step from its heathen to the Christian use. The Alexandrian translators attempted to express the meanings of two frequently recurring words in the Hebrew Scriptures, *קָהָל* and *עֵדָה* by two Greek words, *συναγωγή*, and *ἐκκλησία*, the one meaning an *assembly*, the other having a more specific meaning. This distinction is observed to some extent, in our English translation, by the two words *assembly* and *congregation*, but it is not uniform. It is worthy of note, however, that the Seventy never use *ἐκκλησία* to translate *עֵדָה*. The Israelitish *קָהָל* in the wilderness have some resemblance to the Grecian *ἐκκλησιαί*; there being, as Trench\* well observes, a "probable etymological connection between *קָהָל* and the Greek *καλεῖν*, and thus its relationship, once removed, with *ἐκκλησία*, as indeed also, with the old Latin

---

\* Synonyms of New Testament, p. 20.

*calare*, and our own word *call*, we shall see that it was not without due reason that our Lord (Matt. 16 : 18, 18 : 17,) and his Apostles, claimed this, as the nobler word, to designate the new society of which He was the Founder, being as it was, a society knit together by the closest spiritual bonds, and altogether independent of space."

The first occurrence of the word in the New Testament, is in the reply of our Lord to Peter, in Matt. 16 : 18. "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Our Lord makes a clear distinction between "His church" and "the kingdom of heaven;" yet his subsequent words show, that He referred to that kingdom as set up on the earth. It is also plain that the words "kingdom of heaven," are more comprehensive than the word "church." When he says to Peter, "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," he must mean, that Peter was to act a prominent part, in establishing the kingdom of heaven in the world, as he afterwards did; being honored, not only as "the Apostle of the circumcision," but as the first to open the privileges of the Gospel to the Gentiles." But when he says, Thou art Peter, and upon this (πέτρα) I will build (ᾠκοδομήσω) my church, (ἐκκλησίαν,) it is evident that He does not mean that He will build his church on Peter. The change in genders shows that Peter is not the rock intended. As ἐκκλησία is used metaphorically, as a building, it is evident that πέτρα is used metaphorically also. The church is the building, of which faith in Jesus, as the Church, proved by such a confession, is the production. The Apostles who heard him, with their knowledge of the Grecian *Ekklesia* and of the Septuagint use of the word, must have understood him to mean, a select assembly, a local body of his disciples, of which that institution was the pattern. But then, it was to be "*my Ekklesia*," its fundamental principle, conditions of membership, its design, and doings, were to conform to that grand truth.

The second occurrence of the word, (Matt. 18 : 15, 18,) in our Lord's directions for the removal of offenses, so manifestly applies to a definite, local, organized body of Christians, that no argument is required to prove it. It is a body to which the injured disciple can "tell" his grievance, a body which can hear and judge; a body whose decision the accused must "bear," on penalty of eternal consequences. There is no appeal from the decision of the *Ekklesia*, no higher court in this world; what is bound by it on earth is to be bound in heaven. Nothing intervenes between its doings

and those of heaven above. In these two passages, therefore, the ideal of the church is made known, in our Lord's own words. It is not probable that his disciples, at this time, apprehended his meaning fully. They did not understand the nature of his kingdom, nor the design, or even the necessity of his death, and resurrection.

Passing over the brief intervening period, including the Passover week, the Supper, the last Prayer, the betrayal, crucifixion, burial and resurrection, and the forty days to the festival of the Pentecost, during which "He gave commandments, to the Apostles whom he had chosen, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of *the things pertaining to the kingdom of God*," and we find that a definite, enrolled body of disciples is in existence. "The *number of names* together were about a hundred and twenty." Acts 1 : 15. Reading on, we find this same enrolled body organized, deliberating, and voting. This body is not yet called by any collective historic name, for when Peter rose to address the members, he stood "in the midst of the disciples;" yet, immediately after the outpouring of the Spirit, and the addition of converts, it is recorded, "the Lord added to the *Ekklesia* daily," and that "great fear came on all the *Ekklesia*." Acts 2 : 47, 5 : 11. But immediately, before any other *Ekklesia* is mentioned, before a hint is given that any other is formed, or to be formed, as if to anticipate, and preclude at once, the false notion that the kingdom of heaven is to be comprised in one *Ekklesia*, or that Christ's *Ekklesia* is the continuation, or the remodelling of the Israelitish polity, it is "THE CHURCH WHICH WAS AT JERUSALEM." Acts 8 : 1, 11 : 22. See also, 8 : 3, 9 : 31, 11 : 26, 12 : 1-5, *et seq.* Here, then, beyond all question, we have the brief, yet definite and plain historic developement of the first *Church* that ever existed. The genius of classic, philosophic Greece had suggested the model of its outward form; its inward life was imparted by the doctrine of Christ, and the Spirit of God. It is thus, to use the words of Trench, that "*Ekklesia* is one of those words whose history it is peculiarly interesting to watch, as they obtain a deeper meaning, and receive a new consecration in the Christian Church; which, even while it did not invent, has yet assumed them into its service, and employed them in a far loftier sense than any to which the world had ever put them before." This *Church* was *local*, "at Jerusalem." It met in one place for worship. It had a definite number of enrolled members, all voluntary, all disciples. They had been "pricked in the heart" by Peter's preaching; they had "gladly received his word;" they were such as "the Lord



added to the *Ekklesia*;" they had received the rite of baptism, on evidence of their conversion; they continued to attend on the Apostles' instructions, in fraternal fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers. Thus the true ideal of the *Ekklesia* was developed. The city in which our Lord was rejected, betrayed, crucified, is first blessed with a living embodiment of our Lord's meaning, when he used the word *Ekklesia*.

The doings of this original, and hitherto, only existing *Ekklesia* in the Christian sense, still further illustrate its nature, and design. Love becomes so much the ruling principle, that the members devote their property to the common benefit. Acts 2 : 46. When the care of distribution interferes with the Apostles' appointed work, the *Ekklesia* selects trusty men, of its own number, to attend to it. Acts 6 : 1-7. The Apostles are reckoned as members, (12 : 1, 2;) they continue to act as such, coördinately with the other members, after other churches have been formed, (15 : 22.) When one of them, (Peter) is in peril, "prayer was made without ceasing, of the church, unto God, for him." And from this first church were sent out the first missionaries ever sent forth by act of any associated body of Christians.

Put all these recorded facts together, concentrate all these rays on "the church which was at Jerusalem," and it stands in distinct outline before us, an institution entirely new in the world, deriving its model, its design, and its authority, wholly from the now ascended Saviour, independent of all other control, deliberative, elective, exercising no legislative functions, seeking to know and to execute the will of the Lord Jesus, observing his ordinances, and enjoying all the powers, rights and privileges which pertain to the kingdom of heaven.

Now, if the assumption of the Romish, or the Episcopal, or Lutheran, or Presbyterian body, or anything else claiming to be the "historic church," be true, *viz.*, that there is, and can be but one church, then, beyond all question, that one true church must be "the church that was at Jerusalem." No existing body can make good its claim to that distinction till it can prove that it is a continuation of this the first church ever formed on earth. Then it must show, that no other church was founded; but that as converts were multiplied, and separate congregations became necessary, they continued to be members and constituent parts of this one church in Jerusalem. It must show, that all church power, all authority to receive or expel members, and appoint officers, to ordain ministers, to treat offenders, was given to that church alone,

so that no act of church power or privilege is valid without its sanction. And, as this first "church which was at Jerusalem," is declared to *be* a church on Inspired authority, nothing less than the same authority can establish these positions. Then its claim to be considered as "the church," or "the historic church," a continuation of "the church of the first ages," must rest on equal authority. We are, therefore, shut up to one of two alternatives: either we must take the model of the Christian *Ekklesia*, as drawn by the pen of Inspiration, and set forth in a living reality first in the city of Jerusalem, and form churches according to that model, or we must have Inspired history from the Apostles to the present day, to connect any existing ecclesiasticism with the Apostles.

But how different the facts. Soon, "there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles." Acts 8:1. As the consequence, we are soon told of "churches throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria," (9:31;) then of "the church that was at Antioch," (13:1;) the church in Ephesus, (20:17, 28;) "the church of God in Corinth, (1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1, 1;) "the churches in Macedonia," (8:1;) "the churches of Galatia," (Gal. 1:2;) "the churches of Asia," (1 Cor. 16:19;) "the church of the Laodiceans," (Col. 4:16;) &c., &c. The word *Ekklesia* is applied to all these bodies without any limitation or modification of meaning, in the same sense as to the church in Jerusalem. They are never called parts, or branches of that church, but the same term is applied to them without restriction or qualification.

And not only so, but they are recognized in various ways, as distinct, independent bodies, not as dioceses, provinces, presbyteries, conferences or parishes of *the* church, but as *churches*, without qualification. The church in Antioch soon ordained officers, and sent out preachers, as that at Jerusalem had done before, (13:1;) other churches elect their elders by hand vote, (14:23;) they exercise the highest powers of jurisdiction, that of expelling members, (1 Cor. 5:1-13,) and of restoring them on repentance, (*comp.* 2 Cor. 2:1-11;) they are taught to reject heretics, (Tit. 3; 10;) and censured for allowing those who hold false doctrines to remain among them, (Rev. 2:14, 15;) and very severely for allowing teachers of false doctrines, (2:20.) All these things are spoken of *churches*, as collective, yet distinctly independent bodies, having no organic connection with, nor deriving spiritual, or ecclesiastical authority from the church

at Jerusalem, or any other. Their acts were done in the name, and by the authority of the Lord Jesus alone. 1 Cor. 5 : 4.

Incidentally, too, and therefore most conclusively, it appears that each church was independent and distinct in its pecuniary arrangements. "I robbed *other churches*,"—says Paul to the church in Corinth,—“taking wages of *them* to do *you* service.” (2 Cor. 11 : 8.) It was “*other churches*,” not other portions of *the* church; otherwise the appeal would have no force. “For what is it,” he says again, wherein *ye* [the church in Corinth] were inferior to *other churches*? except it be that I was not burdensome to *you*?” Could any form of address recognize more clearly, the distinct, independent responsibility of each church?

How marvellously do all these allusions to the church fall in with this “Baptistic theory?” The same word which our Lord chose while on earth, he applied “to the seven churches which are in Asia, after he had ascended to Heaven.” They are not combined into the diocese, or presbytery, or synod, or conference of Asia, but they are the seven *churches* in Asia. Each *Ekklesia* is separately addressed, through its minister, or “angel;” each is separately counselled, warned, commanded, censured, or threatened, according as its internal discipline and consequent piety and zeal was satisfactory or otherwise, as directly and separately answerable to the Lord Jesus in person. It would seem as if the glorified Redeemer, foreseeing the perversions of this word by priestly ambition, and the consequent usurpations of priests, popes, and kings in “lording it over God’s heritage,” intended to fix the meaning of his chosen *Ekklesia*, beyond the possibility of mistake. “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the *CHURCHES*,” let him hear the sense in which the Spirit uses that much abused, yet plain, divinely chosen word!

We have said that the word *Ekklesia* occurs one hundred and fifteen times in the New Testament. Let us form a strict analysis and classification of all the passages in which the word is found. They may be divided into three classes.\*

---

\* Here are the passages :

I. Those in which *ἐκκλησία* is used in its original signification, say—(a.) In the Grecian sense, applied to a Grecian assembly. Acts 19 : 32, 39, 41.—(b.) In the same general sense to a Hebrew assembly. Acts 7 : 38. Heb. 2 : 12.

II. Passages in which it is used in its literal Christian sense, to denote a *church*, as explained in the text, under the second class. Matt. 16 : 18; 18 : 17, 17; Acts 2 : 47; 5 : 11; 8 : 1, 3; 9 : 31; 11 : 22, 26; 12 : 1, 5; 13 : 1; 14 : 23, 27; 15 : 3, 4, 22, 41; 16 : 5; 18 : 22; 20 : 17, 28; Rom. 16 : 1, 4, 5, 16, 23; 1 Cor. 1 : 2; 4 : 17; 6 : 4; 7 : 17; 10 : 32; 11 : 16, 18, 22; 12 : 28; 14 : 4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 33,



I. Those in which it is used in its primary Grecian sense. These are Acts 19 : 32, 39, 41. In these passages ἐκκλησία means *the assembly of the qualified citizens called together*; its original literal meaning. The *Ekklesia* held stated and occasional meetings in the *theatron*. It might be called together irregularly, in which case it was not lawful, ἐννομος. but it may still be *Ekklesia*. It may meet by appointment, or at the call of the public crier. The word πλῆθος is more comprehensive, as well as etymologically different. It signifies *the many people*, not *the called, selected people*. It is not, necessarily, a confused and noisy multitude: this is ὄχλος. The word δῆμος denotes, not οἱ πολλοί, *the great mass, the vulgus*, but *the body of citizens, populus*.

These distinctions are nicely observed in the account of the tumult, ταραχος οὐκ ὀλέγος at Ephesus, Acts 19. While Paul was "disputing and persuading concerning the kingdom of God," in the Jewish synagogue in Ephesus, (v. 8, 9,) the πλῆθος was in attendance. When ἡ πόλις ὅλη rushed into the theatre, Paul wished to speak to the δῆμον, because he could not be allowed to speak to the ἐκκλησία. Alexander, being a Jew, was not a member of the ἐκκλησία, so he was drawn from the ὄχλος, (v. 33,) to be the spokesman of the Jews, and clear them of the charge brought against Paul and his companions, of "turning away much people" from the worship of Diana. The *Ekklesia* was "confused," because in their sudden rush into the theatre, (v. 29,) they were mixed up with the "multitude." The γραμματεὺς was obliged to still the "multitude," (v. 35,) before he could address the *Ekklesia*. When the *Ekklesia* was mingled in the theatre with others, the whole assembly is called the δῆμος, (v. 30, 33.) But it was not the ὄχλος, nor the δῆμος, nor the πλῆθος, which the presiding officer addressed and dismissed, but the ἐκκλησία, which was included within, yet distinct from them all. The meeting was an *Ekklesia*, but not an "illegal" *Ekklesia*, (v. 39.) The "town-clerk," γραμματεὺς, scribe, or as Doddridge prefers, *chancellor*, or perhaps better, recorder, in the Ionian cities, of which Ephesus was one, was the head of the municipal government. The "deputy" (v. 38) was the Roman proconsul, responsible to the Roman government, and exer-

---

34, 35; 16 : 1, 19, 19; 2 Cor. 1 : 1; 8 : 1, 18, 19, 23, 24; 11 : 8, 28; 12 : 13; Gal. 1 : 2, 22; Phil. 4 : 15; Col. 4 : 15, 16; 1 Thess. 1 : 1; 2 : 14; 2 Thess. 1 : 1; 4; 1 Tim. 3 : 5, 15; 5 : 16; Philem. 2; James 5 : 14; 3 John 6 : 9, 10; Rev. 1 : 4, 11, 20, 20; 2 : 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 17, 18, 23, 29; 3 : 1; 6 : 7, 13, 14, 22; 22 : 16.

III. Passages in which the word is used, either in the literal sense, as in the second class, or metaphorically, the literal meaning being preserved as the foundation of the metaphor. Eph. 1 : 22; 3 : 10, 21; 5 : 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32; Col. 1 : 18, 24; Heb. 12 : 23; 1 Cor. 15 : 9; Gal. 1 : 13; Phil. 3 : 6.

cised legislative and judicial powers. The Recorder, in his address, rules that the complaint of "Demetrius and the craftsmen," against Paul, was not a proper one to be brought before the *Ekklesia*. It must be brought before the Roman "Deputy." He opens his address to the *Ekklesia* by the very respectful *Andres Ephesioi*, but when he refers to the whole mass of the people present, and the manner in which they came together, he calls it a *mob*. In all these allusions, the distinction between the *Ekklesia* and the mass of the people who came together, is as nicely observed as the distinction between our Senate and the people who may be present, or between a Baptist church and the congregation.

In the same general sense, modified by the Septuagint usage, is the word *ἐκκλησία* applied to the Israelitish *קהל* in the wilderness." Acts 7:38. The whole nation was then living encamped in such near proximity, that the men might easily meet, at short notice, to confer on matters of common interest, yet it is manifest that all the people, men, women and children, did not meet for this purpose. There must have been assemblies of an indiscriminate character, and others of a definite character. This general distinction was expressed in the two words already referred to, the latter being usually translated *Ekklesia*. In this *Ekklesia* Moses presided. Now, surely, Stephen, who was a Hellenist, and knew well, the Grecian, the Alexandrian and the Christian use of *Ekklesia*, would not mean that it was *the Church* in anything like the Christian sense, who "would not obey" Moses, "but thrust him from them, and in their hearts turned back again into Egypt, saying to Aaron, Make us gods," &c. He is reminding the Jews of an *Ekklesia* who "did *always* resist the Holy Ghost," who "received the law by the disposition of Angels and have *not* kept it;"—an *Ekklesia* which relapsed into idolatry, and was utterly rejected. The word *Ekklesia* in Heb. 2:12, has so manifestly the same general meaning, that no argument is needed to show that it should be translated *congregation*, as in Ps. 22:22; of which it is a quotation.

II. In the second class of passages, including four-fifths of the whole, the word is used in its literal Christian meaning. Retaining the original Grecian idea of *ἐκκλησία*, as a local assembly of called, select, qualified members, meeting at stated times and places for the transaction of business of common interest, deliberating and deciding by vote, we find that the called and qualified members are "called to be saints," "born of the Spirit," "believers," "new creatures," "sancti-

fied in Christ Jesus," "holy brethren," "partakers of the divine nature," "heirs of God," "called with a holy calling," and "buried with him [Christ] in baptism." All these and many other like expressions are used, to describe the called and qualified members of the Christian *Ekklesia*. They are "fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God." Their *πολιτεύμα* is in heaven, even as they are made partakers of the heavenly calling. The New Testament contains not an intimation that any others were members of the *Ekklesia* of Jesus Christ. It is called the body of Christ. He loved it, and gave himself for it.

Such are the members of the Christian *ἐκκλησία*, as described by its Builder. And it is because they are such, that the gates of Hell will never prevail against it. Its members, being "kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation," because "chosen in Him before the foundation of the world," will endure to the end. They have, in them, the mystery of a new and Divine life. No one knows, or can know what it is, who is not a partaker of it. Eternal life, the life of God in the soul of man, is the essential qualification to be a member of the *ἐκκλησία* of Jesus Christ. The great difficulty in comprehending the true idea of the church, is, in not first understanding what are the distinctive qualities and characteristics of its members. What can the unregenerate mind know of the church,—a mind not taught by the Spirit, a stranger to the new birth, to repentance, faith, hope and love to God? "The world knoweth us not,"—individually or collectively, "because it knew him not." Nor is it easy for one whose early associations have been mingled up with the confused theories of a church "founded on Abraham," or "built on Peter," or a historical, or territorial, or political hierarchy miscalled a church, or any other theory of a church whose members "*are* born of blood, or of the will of the flesh," to comprehend the true scriptural ideal of the church of Christ.

The Divine mystery of the church begins in the mystery of the new life;—the life of God in the soul of man, the "white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth, saving he that receiveth it." He does not derive this new life from the *ἐκκλησία*, nor through it. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." It is *because* this new life is begun in him, that he is joined to the *Ekklesia*. In the very first mention of the *Ekklesia* as an existing reality, it is recorded that "God *added to*" it, τοὺς σωζομένους, *the saved*. There is, too, in the *Ekklesia* the mystery of Christ's own



presence. In saying, "there am I in the midst of them," after speaking of the church, he means something different from his divine omnipresence. It is "the mystery of godliness," Christ in man. "The economy of the mystery" was arranged as it was, Paul tells us, "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be (made) known by (or through) the *Ekklesia* the manifold wisdom of God." Its members having been called, individually, "into the fellowship (*κοινωνία*) of his Son Jesus Christ," have, by their union in the church, fellowship "with one another." All this proceeds, not on natural, but spiritual principles, and relationships. Thus the *Ekklesia*, the repository of Grecian liberty, now swallowed up by the advancing despotism of the Roman Empire, left its name to be honored far more highly in the kingdom of Christ.

III. There is a third class of passages in which *ἐκκλησία* appears to be used metaphorically, the literal meaning, as in the second class, being preserved as the basis of the metaphor. Thus all the redeemed, as the *called, qualified* members of a literal *Ekklesia*, are spoken of metaphorically, as gathered in one vast *Ekklesia* comprising "the whole family in Heaven and earth;" of which every literal *Ekklesia* is a model. This figurative use of the word confirms the view which we have taken of its literal meaning; for what could we know of the church universal, including the redeemed of every nation, age and clime, until we know what is a literal church? And yet, it is probable, that many of the passages which we have placed in this third class, belong to the second, and are to be understood in the literal sense.

It is worthy of note, that most of the passages of this class occur in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that they include every instance of the use of the word in that epistle; yet the prevailing use of the word, in the writings of Paul, is, as we have seen, to denote a literal church. Why this peculiar use of the word in writing to the Ephesians? It will be observed that five of Paul's epistles, those to the Corinthians, Galatians and Thessalonians, are addressed to the *churches* in those places; while that to the Ephesians, like some others, is addressed "to *the saints* which are at Ephesus." This was not an inadvertence, nor for the sake of variety. It appears that the church in Ephesus contained in it, at that time, the elements of its decay and dissolution. Comp. Acts 20:28-35, with Rev. 2:5. Did Paul, in his use of the word in that epistle, intend to preserve its meaning intact, as expressive of its true idea, yet

by addressing "the saints at Ephesus" as individuals, convey a mild censure and warning? In 1:22, 23, he tells these Ephesian *saints*, that God hath given Christ "to be the head over all things to the church which is his body." This language applies as readily to a literal *Ekklesia*, as in any other sense. Then, in 2:20-22, by a change of the figure, he tells them that *they* "are built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in which,\* [*i. e.* foundation,] all the building, fitly framed together, groweth to a holy temple in the Lord, [*i. e.* Christ,] in which \* ye also are builded together for an habitation of God by the Spirit." The "saints in Ephesus" were "builded together for an habitation of God," but the building was becoming so disjointed, uncouth, disorderly and distasteful to the Lord, that without repentance and reformation, (Rev. 2:5,) it was soon to be overthrown. It was, too, "builded together for AN habitation of God," a form of expression which shows that it was a literal church of which he had been speaking. Thus by most consummate skill in the use of language, Paul so applies the word *Ekklesia*, that while its true and literal sense is preserved, it is applied to "the saints in Ephesus," not as they then were, but as they should be. If they should "repent and do the first works," they would continue to be a true *Ekklesia*, if not, their candlestick would be removed out of its place. It is worth while, at least, to read the epistle with this view, for it is much easier to conceive of an ideal, or metaphorical *Ekklesia* in this world than in heaven and earth. The two instances of its use in the epistle to the Colossians may be explained on the same principles. In 1 Cor. 15:9, Gal. 1:13, Phil. 3:6, the reference is, probably, to the church in Jerusalem. In Heb. 12:23, the meaning of *ἐκκλησία* has been the theme of no small amount of critical inquiry and speculation. It has been generally supposed to refer to glorified spirits in Heaven, and by some to include the angels. But to us, the writer seems to be comparing the superior privileges and dignity of the *Christian* Hebrews, under the gospel dispensation, to those enjoyed by their fathers, even in the early days of their pristine glory, when God came down in fire, and thunder, and darkness, and tempest, and spoke with an audible voice to the people. "Ye are not come," he says, to such terrible manifestations of the Divine presence;—"but ye *are* come, to mount Zion,"—that is, the

\* The words *ἐν ᾧ* seem to relate to *θεμελίῳ*, not to *Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ*, as our version renders them. The Apostle was showing that the Gentiles, no less than the Jews, were built on the teaching of the Prophets.

true Zion, of which the Israelitish was but a type, "to the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem," the Christian *Ekklesia*, the type of Heaven, made up, not like the old Jerusalem, of both the holy and the profane, but of saints only,—“and to myriads of angels assembled in festal gathering;” \* rejoicing over every sinner that repenteth,—“and to a church of first-born [*i. e.* beloved] ones registered in Heaven.” The language, it is true, is strong and glowing, but not more so than in the other portions of the chapter. The writer is describing the scenes to which they “*are come*,” already, not those of another state of existence. An *Ekklesia* formed of Israelites indeed, all born of God, written in the Lamb’s book of life, was a glorious contrast to the old order of things in Israel. If, therefore, any doubt remained respecting the *extent* of our Lord’s meaning in his first use of the word, (Matt. 16 : 18,) for there can be no doubt respecting the *class* of persons of whom his *Ekklesia* was to be composed,—it must be removed, entirely, by this uniform application of the word by the inspired writers, both in its literal, and metaphorical significations.

We have now examined every passage† in which the word occurs, where the meaning is at all obscure, and this is the result. We may regard it as certain, that *Ekklesia* is never used in the New Testament to signify an edifice, nor is it applied to a body of ecclesiastical rulers, nor to all the Christians in a nation, or province, or state. It is never applied to a collection of religious societies, federated or united by some extensive bond of union, as those worldly hierarchies called “the Church of Rome,” or “the Church of England,” or by constitutions and canons, as “the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,” or “the Methodist Episcopal Church,” or “the Presbyterian Church,” of any of its diverse “Schools.” A territorial *Ekklesia* is a self-contradictory term. It is, in its nature, a local assembly. And even then, if it admits members on any other condition than that they are “born of the Spirit,” “sancti-

\* The πανηγυρίς,” says Trench, “differs from the ἐκκλησία in this : that in the ἐκκλησία there lay ever the sense of an assembly that had come together for the transaction of business. The πανηγυρίς, on the other hand, was a great assembly for purposes of festal rejoicing ; and on this account it is found joined continually with ἑορτή, see Ezk. 46 : 11. Hos. 2 : 11 ; 9 : 5. It is the angels who are in πανηγυρι.

† The word which is translated “robbers of churches,” in Acts 19 : 37, is ἱεροσυλοῦς, from the verb which in Rom. 2 : 22 is translated, to “commit sacrilege.” It means those who desecrated sacred places, as the heathen regarded their temples. Why our English translators make the Ephesian “town-clerk,” talk about “robbers of churches,” while as yet there were no churches, (*i. e.*, church edifices, the sense in which they intended it,) to be robbed, it is not easy to see.



fied in Christ Jesus, called to be saints," it is no longer Christ's *Ekklesia*.

A fanciful theory has been broached, that the Christian Church was copied from the Jewish Synagogue. Neander, in his earlier writings, favored this motion, in which he was largely followed by Coleman, in his "Church without a Bishop." But Neander in his General History, admits that the government of the synagogue was aristocratic, while that of the *Ekklesia* was democratic; and by his manner of writing, plainly intimates that he had lost confidence in the theory. It certainly has not the shadow of support in the New Testament, while the contemptuous manner in which the word *Synagogue* is twice used, (Rev. 2: 9; 3: 9) is a plain hint that it was superseded and abolished.

From this investigation, we submit the following conclusions, as established facts, or legitimate inferences, viz.:

1. That *ἐκκλησία*, like *βαπτίζω*, both words being purely of Greek origin, having acquired a definite, well known meaning long before the time of our Saviour, was uniformly applied to a local assembly of a definite number of select members, called together for the transaction of its appropriate business.

2. The selection of a purely Greek, not a Hebrew word, as the term, and the only term by which to designate the associated, organized Christian brotherhood in this world, is sufficient to prove, in the absence of all contrary evidence, that a church is not the continuation of any previously existing Jewish institution, certainly not of any constitution set up by Abraham or Moses.

3. That the Apostles, evidently following the instructions of our Lord, used this word in a uniform sense; they planted churches, all composed of converts received by the rite of baptism on evidence of their faith in Christ, and united in fellowship to sustain the worship, ordinances, and discipline of the house of God.

4. That whenever the word is used figuratively, or in any other than the ordinary literal sense, it is only with an extension of meaning, the literal signification always being preserved.

5. That the word *ἐκκλησία*, whatever may have been the usage of *κυριακον* in the later Greek, is never applied, in the New Testament to a building, nor to include all the Christians in a kingdom, or province, nor to a council, nor to any territorial, federated or aggregated body whatever.

6. That the *Ekklesia* denotes *polity*; both in its original and Christian usage. It is not applied to Christians as such,

but to Christians affiliated, organized, as the representative body of Christ, acting in his name, and with his authority, in matters pertaining to his kingdom. A body of disciples in that capacity form the Christian *Ekklesia*.

7. That each Christian *Ekklesia* was separately and directly responsible to the Lord, the only head; not subject to the authority of any council, synod, conference, bishop, cardinal or pope.

8. That as no outward organic relations of dependence, or subordination of church with church, were established by our Lord and his apostles, no necessity can exist for any such relations now, between existing churches, or with those of the first ages, if it were possible to trace up, historically such relations.

9. That the indwelling spirit and authority of the Lord Christ in any church, must depend not at all on organic unions, or relations to other churches, ancient or modern, but solely on its conformity to the principles which he has laid down,—obedience to his precepts, and the fervor of its love.

Do we, then, "break with the whole Christianity of the first ages," by holding these principles? By no means. We bring the Christianity of all ages, of our own age, to the only sure and unfailing standard. Our controversy with these traditionary churchists, is like that of Paul with the sticklers for Judaism. As he was obliged to go back, beyond the Rabbins, and beyond Moses, to Abraham, to vindicate the true import of circumcision, and justification by faith, so we appeal to the teachings and practice of our Lord and his Apostles, against all intervening authorities, for the true doctrine of the church, its symbols, and its sacraments. "Do we, then," says Paul, "make void the law through faith? Nay, we establish the law." We do not make void the Christianity of any age, we confirm all that is good. We claim the confessors and martyrs of Christ, of all ages, as our brethren in the faith. Is an ecclesiastically organic relation necessary for this purpose? Are we not all, as Christians, spiritually allied to the pious Jews, to David, to Isaiah, to Moses, to Abraham, to Job, to Noah, and to Enoch, with none of whom we have sustained ecclesiastical relations? Why, then, should it be thought a thing incredible, that the "Baptistic Puritanism," is as really connected with the faith and religious life of the Christianity that conquered the Roman world," as any other form of polity?

But we go further, and claim that these principles offer the only possible method of Christian union, and church unity throughout the Kingdom of Christ. As our churches

have no organic connections, no constitutional or canonical entanglements, so fruitful of encroachments, and schisms, they have no occasion for extensive unions, except to promote the common good, by extending the Kingdom of Christ. Each church being at liberty to act alone or in connection with other churches, according to its own views of duty, in the great work, the fairest prospect is presented for spiritual unity, and coöperation. All that is needed further is, that each church be animated in the highest degree, by the love of Christ, and thoroughly enlightened in respect to its obligations, and the best methods of doing good. Then, though the number of such churches, distinctly independent in organization, but one in principle, faith, and love, were multiplied as the sands of the sea, they would be like drops of water, ever ready to unite, and intermingle, and fertilize the waste places of the earth. What has *churchism* to say to this? That this ideal state of Christian unity, has never yet been realized through the Baptist Churches? True, but through how many ages have these principles been crushed, under political ecclesiasticisms, state establishments, and overshadowing sects, with their unchanging creeds, rubrics, bonds of union, books, and schools? In free America these principles have risen, and gone forth with surprising swiftness. If they shall ally to themselves holiness in a high degree, learning and zeal bridled by love, a glorious future awaits them.

Now, can any objection lie against this "Baptistic" method of finding the answer to the question, "*What is the Church?*" which does not lie equally against receiving the Bible as the only ultimate authority in matters of faith and practice? Is not the answer to this question a point, and a very essential point of our faith? And does it not give direction to our practice? If we had lived in the Apostolic age, would not the teaching, and the example of the Apostles have been the ultimate authority on this question? What sure and unerring guide have we, to their teachings and practice, but the Inspired Record? Does not that Record give us the only information we have of the origin of the Church,—the Christian *ἐκκλησία*? Put that Record out of the debate, and who can answer the question, "*What is the Church?*" What could be more discordant than the voices of tradition and history? Who is to reconcile them? What is the standard by which to try them? If the New Testament be rejected, there is none. But ours is the true Baconian method. How do we come to the knowledge of any ancient institution, the Grecian *Ekklesia* for instance? Is it not by



searching out, examining, comparing and classifying the accounts of it in Grecian literature? And is not Apostolic literature as worthy to be trusted? Where else can we find the true description of the Apostolic *Ekklesia*?

Are we accused of making the church a mere *voluntary society*, after Rousseau's theory of the *social contract*, because we say that churches have no necessary organic connection? And because we say, that conformity to Apostolic principles, and the Apostolic faith and life, are all that is necessary to constitute a church? We reply, the accusation is unjust. The Church is not a mere voluntary society, it is of God's appointment, of Divine architecture, not left at all to human contrivance, or legislation. Jesus Christ is "head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who filleth all in all." No man, or set of men, have the right to form a church to suit their notions, or convenience. A church is "God's building." As the tabernacle and all the symbols of worship were to be made strictly according to the pattern shown to Moses in the Mount, as the architecture of the Temple, its furniture and arrangements were prescribed by God himself, so the Church must be made of such materials, and so joined together, as God has appointed. Its life, its authority, must come directly from its Divine Head. The indwelling presence of Christ in the Church, is its life. But as the first converts under the Apostolic preaching were voluntary in uniting themselves to the Church, because they had "gladly received the word, so must all others be. It is written in the Prophets, that when the Spirit of God should be poured out, in the gospel day, "one shall say, 'I am the Lord's;,' and another shall *call himself* by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe *with his hand* unto the Lord, and *surname himself* by the name of Israel." It came to pass even so, in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Philippi, in the Sandwich Islands, and in Burmah; wherever the Gospel was preached, the converts voluntarily united themselves to the Church. And could any one be a fit member of the church who was not voluntary? So we preach, and so we believe. But when we say, that union with the church is a voluntary act, we do not say that it is left to the opinions of men. To be a member of the church is a *duty*; and because it is a duty, it must be voluntary. If it were not voluntary, it could not be a duty. Does this make the Church a mere voluntary society, like a temperance society? No more than Heaven is a voluntary society, because all who go there will go voluntarily.

We say, that the Church is a Divine Institution, the

embodiment of a divine idea, sustained by a divine life. To perpetuate and extend this life, is its design and purpose. Its members are all "kings and priests unto God." There is but one High Priest in our profession, who has passed into the Heavens, having procured eternal redemption for us. When he ascended on high, he gave *gifts δόματα, χαρίσματα*,\* for the preparing of his people for the work of enlarging the body of Christ. The great idea, then, in the formation of a church is, that it be "*an* habitation of God through the Spirit." We have no right to set up a church, even after the Apostolic pattern, for any other purpose. No ambitious desire for "church extension," no rivalry of sect, no schism, or church feud, can furnish a valid reason for the formation of a church. The will of Christ alone, is the rule of action. Each church is designed for an endless growth. Its first members are the nucleus, to which others are to be attracted; around which the members of the body are to be gathered, and crystallized. As like attracts like, the body will be conformed to its constituting elements. If the divine life reigns vigorously in these primal elements, we may hope that it will permeate, and animate all its accretions. If these primal elements be sluggish, pulseless, malformed, such will be the body. The first or constituting members of every church, should therefore be persons of approved and eminent piety, as well as wisdom. When the primitive churches were planted, the first converts in any city or village whether from Judaism, or heathenism, must necessarily be the rulers of the church. Such must be, also, the practice in forming churches, at the present day, in heathen countries, under the direction of our missionaries. But in Christian communities we have the lights of history, as well as the Scriptures, to guide us. We are forewarned of those evils which subverted the early churches. We can know what doctrines, and practices have stood the scrutiny of ages. And as we have in our churches, members of experience, of tried integrity and Christian wisdom, they should be selected to form the nuclei of new churches, wherever they can be found. No others should be incorporated at the outset, and in its progress, great care should be taken to admit none but the truly sanctified. And the messengers of the churches should resolutely, and conscientiously refuse to recognize, as a church, any combination of persons, who fail to give evidence of being living stones, prepared to be fitly framed together, able and pledged to sustain the regular, stated wor-

---

\*1 Cor. 12 : 9; Eph. 4 : 8.

ship of God, the doctrines, ordinances, and discipline of His house.

The usage of the word *Church*, in English literature, is a striking instance of the looseness and confusion of ideas which follows the perversion of terms from their true meaning. That word is the translation of the New Testament *Ekklesia*, with which it should properly correspond in meaning. But it has wandered very far from its original, simple, definite signification. The writers of the New Testament never confounded *Ekklesia* with "the kingdom (*βασιλεια*) of heaven, or "the kingdom of God," or "the kingdom of his dear Son." When Paul would speak of all the redeemed of Christ, both on earth and in heaven, he does not call them the *Ekklesia*, but *the whole family in Heaven and on Earth!*\* Does not this palpable departure of English literature from the simplicity, and the precision of the New Testament writers, indicate an equally wide departure from the practice of the Apostles? They, certainly, meant something definite when they spoke of a church, but we doubt whether one platform or pulpit speaker in five hundred does affix any definite idea to the word. We hear about "the church," the "ancient church," "the modern church," "the American church," "the Oriental church," &c. Leaving out a host, which time and space would fail us to record, we even hear of "the Baptist church," and that too, from Baptist lips, as though all who call themselves Baptists are, in some sense included in one church! But the truth is, no one church, ever did, or was ever designed to be co-extensive with the kingdom of Christ. That kingdom includes all who acknowledge the Lord Christ as the one lawgiver, and yield Him spiritual obedience; but it was never designed to be included in one visible polity. It is the kingdom of truth, of righteousness, of faith and hope, ever extending beyond even its normal politic boundaries, hemmed in by no sacerdotal order, no rubrics, creeds, or covenants, but seeking such as worship the Father in spirit and in truth. Still, it is the high privilege and duty of the disciples of Christ to be visibly united in the church, which is his body, in order to exemplify the power and excellence of his religion. Christ is glorified in the church. We regard the church, therefore, as an institution of the utmost importance. As Baptists, we have no reason to be pleased with the unchurchly notions of Neander, in his representations of early Christianity. Our theory of the church is not merely

---

\* Eph. 3 : 65.



negative, revolutionary, and levelling. We believe in a positive, definite Church, the *type* of Heaven itself; subject to Christ directly and alone, even as the wife is to the husband of her love. "This is a great mystery, but we speak concerning Christ and the Church." The mystery of the church is not in its polity, or the union, or the relationship of its members, or the effects of its sacraments, but in the hidden life of its members, their personal union to their Redeemer and Head, and his abiding presence among them.

Is it presumption in us to say, that in this theory of the church, every passage of Scripture, every doctrine, ordinance, and symbol of Christianity is harmonized? Individual responsibility is fully recognized. The father is not accountable for the children, nor the children for the father. Each one is held responsible for his own conduct. The church is made up of voluntary members, admitted only on giving to the church evidence of being born of the Spirit; which great truth is symbolized in their baptism, the emblem of the death, burial, and resurrection of the Son of God. As long as believers are "buried with Christ by baptism into death," so long will the doctrine of human depravity and the atonement, guilt and pardon, defilement and cleansing, death to sin, and the new birth to righteousness, human helplessness and Divine substitution, be set forth in living forms before the world. So long will it be taught, that the members of the church "were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Yet the parental relation, and obligations, remain in full force. The mother's prayer, the father's counsel and example, the pious nurture, all that renders the family relations dear and sacred, is available in the highest possible degree, in this view of the church. Neither parents nor children are lulled to sleep in sin by depending on propagated holiness, or "grace-bearing sacraments." How greatly must the parent feel the obligation to pray with and for his children, to instruct them in the word of God, and to set before them a holy example, when he has constantly before his eyes the truth, that they are not in the church of Christ because not fit for that holy profession! Is it not a solemn thought, that the boundary line between the church and the world runs through households and families, between parents and children, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, as between the wise and foolish virgins, proclaiming daily, that without holiness no one can see the Lord?

But we cannot follow the applications of this doctrine of

the church. Its truth and importance have not saved it, and will not save it from perversion and abuse. It is much easier to vindicate it from the cavils and sophistries of its opponents, than from the unworthy conduct of its friends. Alas! how often have churches, so-called, been formed as the result of a schism, or to carry out some ulterior measure? And how inconsiderately are the solemn obligations of the church assumed! How poorly qualified are many ministers to "take care of the Church of God!" They may be scholars, thinkers, and orators, well instructed in everything but the nature, the structure, the government, and discipline of the church. Our theological seminaries have been strangely remiss in this branch of ministerial training. If the time spent in plodding through the sickening history of the corruptions of Christianity by false theories of the church, were devoted to a thorough Scriptural and historical inquiry into the church as it should be, we should not be mortified with the spectacle of so many disordered and deformed churches, presided over by neophytes who pull down with one hand what they build up with the other. A true church is a living body, an habitation of the Spirit, in which the doctrine, the ordinances, and the discipline of the house of God, are working together for the sanctification of its members, and the conversion of the world. If this heavenly fire is allowed to die out from its altar, it is no more a church. A list of names of persons who meet when some preacher comes along, but neglect the regular communion of saints on the Lord's day, and allow unworthy members to disgrace the name of Christ, is not a true church. Such is not the kind of church which Paul had in mind when he wrote, "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for her, in order that he might sanctify her; cleansing in the bath of water by the word, that he might present to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but be holy, even without blemish."

---

## ART. VII.—GEOGRAPHICAL ACCURACY OF THE BIBLE.

UNDER this title we propose to mention some instances in which the observations of the traveler in Palestine enable him to verify the accuracy of the sacred writers in the geographical notices and local allusions which occur on almost every page of the Bible. The subject is an extensive one, and admits of a limited illustration only within the compass of this article. We shall restrict ourselves to a few examples of an incidental character, which stand in some special relation to the personal observations of the writer.

### VALUE OF SUCH ACCURACY.

Before entering on our immediate object here, we would premise a remark or two respecting the value of this agreement between the Scriptures and the geography of the holy land, as a testimony to the truth of the Bible. Regarded in the light of such testimony, it has both a negative and a positive side. It not only frees the Bible from a class of objections which might be and have been urged against its claims to veracity, but, in so far as the agreement can be shown to be obviously unstudied, incidental, it furnishes a direct proof of the truthful character of the sacred Word.

The following supposition will illustrate this statement. We read in the book of Genesis, that when Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by fire from heaven, Abraham was dwelling in his tent by the oaks of Mamre, near Hebron, (Genesis 18 : 1.) On the morning after that awful catastrophe, it is said that "he looked toward" the site of those cities, "and all the land of the plain, and beheld, and lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace," (Genesis 19 : 28.) Suppose travelers now had returned from the East, saying that the region of the Dead Sea is not visible from the neighborhood of Hebron, and that Abraham, therefore, could never have seen any rising smoke from that position, what a shock would this give to our confidence in the Bible! Every one feels that such a representation, if true, would encumber the Scriptures with a serious difficulty. If such errors are to be found in them, if the writers betray such ignorance of the relative situation of the places which they mention, they would incur the suspicion of having



recorded not facts but inventions of their own, or mythic traditions in which they could no longer distinguish the true and the false from each other. If convicted of mistakes here, who could resist the impression that they may be fallible also as religious teachers, and thus forfeit the character from which they claim their authority over the faith and consciences of men? Hence, to show that objections of this nature have no proper foundation, subserves a two-fold purpose: it turns back one of the weapons with which opposers have assailed the truth of the Scriptures, and, at the same time, strengthens our confidence in them as authentic, reliable, and capable of receiving fresh confirmation from the results of all true progress in investigation and knowledge.

We presented just now an imaginary case, for the purpose of illustration. We return to that to say that the geography of the Pentateuch, so far from being involved in any contradiction by what is said of Abraham on the occasion referred to, is confirmed entirely by the testimony of eye-witnesses. From the height which overlooks Hebron, where Abraham stood, as he beheld the proof that the guilty cities had perished, the observer at the present day has an extensive view spread out before him towards the Dead Sea. The hills of Moab, sloping down towards that sea on the east, and a part of Idumea, are all in sight. A cloud of smoke rising from the plain would be visible to a person at Hebron now, and could have been, therefore, to Abraham, as he looked towards Sodom on the morning after its destruction by Jehovah.

We pass now from these preliminary remarks to the proper subject of this article.

#### NOTICE OF BETHEL.

We spent the night of the twenty-eighth of April, at Beitin, the Bethel, in Jacob's history, where he saw the vision of the ladder, with the angels ascending and descending upon it. This village is about twelve miles north of Jerusalem. A brief notice is due to a place of so much interest. The village now there, which has succeeded to the ancient one, stands on the declivity of a hill which slopes towards the south. The highway which led from Judea to Galilee runs a little to the west, and a narrow valley, extremely fertile, lies on the east. Bethel is first mentioned in Genesis 12: 8. As Abraham stopped there once and again in his pastoral migrations, we may infer that he found the country well adapted to grazing purposes. It answers to that description still. I do not recollect to have seen anywhere so many

herds of cattle, and of such fine appearance, as I saw in this particular region. The basin of an immense reservoir still remains at the foot of the hill; the southern wall of which is quite perfect, though the other parts are more or less broken or have disappeared.\* No one can see this ruin, and doubt that it belongs to an early Hebrew age; for the size and peculiar shape of the stones afford decisive proof of such an origin. A small pool of water was standing at the east end of the reservoir, in which the frogs were croaking in a lively manner. Two living springs, also, issue from the ground, to which females from the village came down, from time to time, and filled their pitchers. The other ruins there are of a mixed character. Some have thought that they could distinguish among them the remains of churches and military towers built by the crusaders, as well as single stones and heaps of rubbish, which may date back to Jewish times.

#### PARTING OF ABRAHAM AND LOT.

We encamped for the night within the enclosure of the old reservoir. It was my privilege on that evening to bow the knee, and invoke the protection of God, where Jacob of old lodged as a wayfarer, and vowed "that if God would be with him, and would keep him in the way that he should go, and cause him to come again to his father's house in peace, then the Lord should be his God," and he would serve him more perfectly, (Genesis 28 : 16, sq.) While the men were putting up the tent and preparing for the evening meal, I went to an eminence, within sight on the east, to examine the ruins of a fortress and a church, which are found there. From this height I had a distinct view of the Jordan over the tops of the intervening hills, and could trace its course for some considerable distance, north and south, by means of the rich verdure which lined its margin on both sides. In one place I thought I could see a white foam or spray, as if the current was broken by some obstruction. In this opinion I was probably correct, for Lieutenant Lynch, who floated down the Jordan, from the Lake of Galilee to the Dead Sea, ascertained that the river, in its intermediate course, rushes over not fewer than twenty-seven violent rapids, in addition to many others which are less precipitous.

As I stood surveying this scene I must have been near the spot where Abraham and Lot parted from each other, as

---

\* The dimensions of the tank are given as three hundred and fourteen feet in length, and two hundred and seventeen feet in breadth.

related in the thirteenth chapter of Genesis. Abraham, it is said, on his return from Egypt, "pitched his tent between Bethel and Hai." This latter place can be shown to have been, in all probability, near the modern Deir Diwan, which was conspicuous from where I stood, a little to the south-east of Beitin, or Bethel. Hence, my position here was "between Bethel and Hai," which the sacred narrative designates as the place where Abraham encamped. We are told that the possessions of the patriarch had become great; he "was very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold." So, also, Lot, "who went with him, had flocks and herds and tents." To procure, therefore, an ample range of pasturage, and to put an end to the quarrels which had begun to arise between their respective herdsmen, Abraham proposed to Lot that they should separate, and dwell in different parts of the land. Hear the venerable Sheikh's magnanimous offer. "Is not the whole land before thee? Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me; if thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." Now follows the circumstance which shows how quietly but rigidly the narrative adjusts itself to the external situation of the parties. "And Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, \* \* even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt. Then Lot chose him all the plain of Jordan, and Lot journeyed east; and they separated themselves the one from the other." It is to be remarked now that it is not by any means at every point not more remote from the Jordan than this eminence "between Bethel and Hai," that the traveler, as he pursues his journey northward, obtains a view of the river and its fields. Higher ground may intervene to cut off the prospect. Then again the appearance of the valley of the Jordan, where it comes into sight from some particular place, may be, not that of a fertile, inviting region, but unproductive, forbidding.\* Just here, on the contrary, a little to the east of Bethel, the eye rests at this moment upon exactly such a scene as Lot is represented as beholding when he selected "the plain of the Jordan" as the place of his residence.† There is the river gleaming over the hill-tops; there are the broad meadows visible on either bank; and the

---

\* As to the varying aspects of the valley of the Jordan, though in the main exceedingly fertile, the reader will find definite information in Lynch's account of his voyage from the Lake of Galilee to the Dead Sea.

† The catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah altered the character of the southern part of the valley; but there is no reason to suppose that it affected the part north of the Dead Sea.



waving line of verdure which marks the course of the stream, I can not better describe than by saying, after the example of the sacred writer, that it reminds one, though certainly much less imposing, of the rich fields fertilized by the Nile, as the beholder looks down upon them from the great pyramid near Cairo. The valley of the Jordan, as seen here, lies "east" from Bethel; precisely the direction in which Lot moved, after making choice of that region as his future home.

I can not expect to excite in the reader's mind the interest which such an observation excited in my own. It may be necessary that one should stand on the spot and survey the landscape with his own eyes, in order to perceive the full effect of such a confirmation of the truth of the Bible; but surely no one who has done so,—who has traversed the country and observed how its minutest geographical features are reflected back to us in the Scriptures,—can doubt that the writers lived amid the scenes which they describe, and have interwoven in their narratives so many accurate allusions to them, because truth, always consistent with itself, was their guide.

#### BATTLE-FIELD OF SAUL AND THE PHILISTINES.

My pilgrimage brought me in the forenoon of May first, to Jenin, on the southern border of the plain of Esdraelon. This village, having a population of some two thousand, may be the modern representative of En-Ganim, which existed at the time of the Hebrew conquest, (Joshua 19 : 21 ; 21 : 29.) It is certainly the *Ginæa* of Josephus, who mentions it as one of the boundaries between Samaria and Galilee. Here we halted about two hours, under the shade of a wide-spreading mulberry tree, by the side of a beautiful stream which flows westward through the plain, and swells the waters of the Kishon, near the sea. At noon, just as the muezzin, or crier, was heard from the balcony of the minaret, calling the faithful to prayers, we resumed our march, and launched forth upon the magnificent plain of Esdraelon or Jezreel.\* This plain stretches (leaving out of view some minor irregularities) from the Mediterranean, between Akka on the north and the head of Carmel on the south, across the country, with an average width of ten or twelve miles, to the river Jordan on the east. It forms a break down between the mountains of Lebanon on the north and those of Samaria on the south. It is, for the most part, quite level, with only slight undula-

---

\* Jezreel is the Hebrew, Esdraelon the Greek, form of the name.

tions here and there. This plain has been a battle-field of the most sanguinary dye, from the days of Barak to Napoleon, who, with a handful of French, defeated here a large Turkish army. Dr. Clark, the traveler, observes in just, as well as beautiful language, that "warriors out of every nation which is under heaven, have pitched their tents in the Plain of Esdraelon, and have beheld the various banners of their nations wet with the dews of Tabor and of Hermon."\* An isolated ridge of rocky heights extends from the direction of the Jordan into this valley towards the west, which is the Gilboa of Scripture; a name which David's touching elegy on Saul and Jonathan will preserve forever in the memory of mankind. The words of the sad lament linger still upon our ears.

"Ye mountains of Gilboa!  
Let there be no dew nor rain upon you,  
Nor fields of offerings;  
For there was cast away the shield of the mighty,  
The shield of Saul, as though he had not been anointed.  
From the blood of the slain, from the flesh of the mighty,  
The bow of Jonathan turned not back,  
The sword of Saul returned not in vain.

"Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives,  
And in their death they were not divided.  
They were swifter than eagles,  
They were stronger than lions.

"Daughters of Israel! weep for them.  
How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle!  
O, Jonathan! slain upon thy mountains!  
Woe is me for thee—my brother Jonathan!

"How are the mighty fallen!  
And the weapons of war perished!"

The account of the battle which resulted in the death of the Hebrew king, not only mentions the general scene of the action, but embraces the names of several places, which are introduced as sustaining not vague, but altogether definite, complicated relations to each other. If these places, now, can be identified still, and if the connections between them implied in the narrative are found to be entirely natural, and appropriate to the events referred to them, may we not reasonably adduce this agreement as a corroboration of the Scripture history?

---

\* Travels, &c., vol. ii., p. 499.

The following summary recapitulates the events as far as the present object requires. The combatants in the battle, which proved so disastrous to Saul, lay encamped, at first, the Israelites on Gilboa, the Philistines at Shunem. They appear subsequently to have changed their position; the Israelites are said to have pitched their tents at a fountain near Jezreel, and the Philistines at Aphek. On the night before the battle Saul proceeded to Endor to consult a sorceress respecting the event of the approaching conflict; it is implied that he rejoined his army after an absence of a few hours only. The final encounter took place on Gilboa, and the Philistines, who were the conquerors, having found the dead body of Saul among the slain, carried it to Bethshean, and hung it up on the walls of the city. All these places, now, if the narrative be true, must have been near each other; must have been so situated as to admit of the rapid movements, hither and thither, which the complications of a battle involve, and some of them, at least, as we may presume, afforded to the parties certain military advantages, leading them to select just these positions rather than others. The question arises, then, Does an inspection of the scene where the contest between Saul and the Philistines is said to have occurred verify these conditions? Have the names of the places outlived the revolutions of so many ages, and does their present situation agree with the circumstances under which the sacred writer has introduced them?

I venture to affirm that a person who compares the Bible account of this battle with the region around Gilboa, has the same sort (if not degree) of evidence that the account relates what is true, that a person would have that such battles as those of Saratoga, Yorktown or Waterloo, really took place, who should compare the current histories of those achievements with the places where they were performed. Gilboa as the name of a hamlet on the ridge of mountains anciently known under that appellation, as well as Jezreel, Shunem, Endor, Bethshean, are all found still bearing the same names.\* They lie almost within sight of each other. A person can start from any one of them and make the circuit of them all in a few hours. Aphek is the only one of the cluster not yet identified. Jezreel is on the northern slope of Gilboa, and at the distance of twenty minutes to the east is a large fountain, and a smaller one, still nearer;

---

\*I make no account here of the slightly different form which the Arabic pronunciation gives to some of the names; because the change is so trifling as to leave no doubt that they are the places mentioned in Scripture.



just the position which a chieftain would select, both on account of its elevation and the supply of water needed for his troops. Opposite to Jezreel, across a narrow valley, on the side of a parallel ridge, is Shunem, where the Philistines could watch the movements of the enemy with great advantage. Again, a village, Endor, lies on the northern side of the same ridge; so that Saul, leaving his camp at Jezreel, could steal his way, under cover of the night, across the intervening valley, and over the moderate summit which he would have to ascend, and then, after his consultation with the woman of Endor, could return to his forces without having been missed by any, except those in the secret. Finally, Bethshean, now Beisan, a little to the east, in the valley of the Jordan, visible, in fact, from Jezreel, must have been, judging from its natural facilities, a strong place; and hence, the Philistines, after the battle, would naturally take possession of such a town; so that we find them entrenched precisely where we might expect, when we read of their mutilating there the body of Saul, as a part of their barbarous celebration of the victory.

It is well known that some of the most celebrated battle-fields of Grecian and Roman history correspond, at present, but imperfectly with the descriptions of ancient writers. It is found to be impossible, beyond a very general outline, to ascertain the position, and to trace the movements, of the contending armies. The reason of this is, not that we have any special occasion to question the trustworthiness of the writers, but because, no doubt, villages which they mention have changed their names, or have entirely disappeared; or because, in some instances, the convulsions of nature may have altered the course of streams, or disturbed the ancient demarcations between hills and valleys. Yet, Saul's last battle-field remains to this day mapped out before us on the face of the country almost as distinctly as if what was done there had been a contemporary event; though the Bible relates it of an age even more remote than that of the founding of Rome, of one later but a little than the siege of Troy.

#### SITUATION OF SAMARIA.

This celebrated capital of the ten tribes was situated on a hill, rising abruptly from the bosom of a beautiful valley to the height of some four hundred feet, and surrounded by a circle of hills still higher. A small Arab village hangs on the eastern brow of the eminence, called Sebastieh, a cor-

ruption of the Greek *Sebaste*, the name which Herod the Great gave to Samaria in honor of Augustus.

I spent several hours, on the twenty-ninth of April, in examining this interesting locality, and then crossed the mountains on the north of the valley, on my way to Nazareth. I was thinking, as I proceeded, of a passage in the book of Amos, and was anxious to know how strictly it was to be understood. The prophet (Amos 3: 9, 10,) by a bold poetic figure, summons the inhabitants of Ashdod and Egypt to assemble on the hills around Samaria, and to see with their own eyes the iniquity practised there. They are called upon as heathen to testify against the wickedness of the professed people of God, and to pronounce them deserving of the punishment which the prophet affirms that they are about to incur.

“Publish on the palaces\* in Ashdod  
And on the palaces in the land of Egypt,  
And say:  
‘Assemble on the mountains of Samaria,  
And behold the great tumults in her midst,  
And the oppressions in her;’  
‘For they know not how to do right,’  
Says Jehovah,  
‘Who store up violence and pillage in their palaces.’”

It will be observed that the heathen witnesses in this case are supposed to take their stand on the hills which surround Samaria, and to be able from that position to look down upon the city as exposed to their view below them. To what extent, now, is this representation figurative? How far does it conform to the actual condition of the country?

In my ascent of the mountains which I had to cross, I cast back an anxious eye, from time to time, to see whether I was rising above the level of the ancient Samaria. It was not long before I found myself off against the summit; and then after this, as other heights still followed, I soon had the pleasure of beholding the site of the once flourishing town lying below me; of feeling that I stood where I could fairly overlook, not only the valley, but the mount, which imparts to it so much beauty. I am sure that, had the ancient capital still crowned its summit, I could have looked into it, and seen the people in the streets, and distinguished their occupations.

---

\* That is, on the roofs of them, which afforded the herald a convenient place for being heard.

## ADVANCE OF THE ASSYRIANS.

During my sojourn of a month at Jerusalem I, made several excursions into the neighboring country. One of these embraced a visit to Anata, Beit Hanina, Neby Samuil, and other places. Leaving the Damascus gate about noon, we crossed the upper part of the valley of Jehoshaphat, and, pursuing a north-eastern course, with the Mount of Olives off to the right, arrived, after an hour and a half, at Anata, the birth-place of Jeremiah. This village stands on a height which presents to the observer a wide prospect towards the north and north-east; and among the towns within sight were Jeba, and Er-Ram, names which identify them unquestionably with Gibeah and Ramah; while, a little further off, but not visible here, was Mukhmas, which must be the same as Michmash. Thus, four of the places which Isaiah mentions (10:28, sq.) in his description of the approach of the Assyrian army, are found near each other, and north of Jerusalem; occupying precisely the situation which the poet's object in referring to them requires. He sees the enemy pouring down from the north; they reach, at length, the neighborhood of the devoted city; they take possession of one village after another; while the inhabitants flee at their approach, and fill the country with cries of terror and distress. A more spirited sketch of a hostile invasion is not to be found in any writer. It must be read in the Hebrew in order to be fully appreciated.

"He comes to Ai, passes through Migron,  
At Michmash deposits his baggage;  
They cross the pass, Geba is our night station;  
Terrified is Ramah, Gibeah of Saul flees.  
Shriek with thy voice, daughter of, Gallim;  
Listen, O Laish; ah, poor Anathoth!  
Madmenah escapes, dwellers in Gebim take flight.\*  
Yet this day he halts at Nob;  
He shakes his fist against the mount, daughter of Zion,  
The hill of Jerusalem."

The pass or passage here, called "the passage of Michmash" in 1 Samuel 13:23, is, probably, says Dr. Robinson, "a steep, precipitous valley," which he crossed just before coming to the modern Mukhmas. Nob, a name which has perished, appears to have been the last station in their line of march, whence they could see Jerusalem, and whence they

---

\* The full idea, says Gesenius, is, that they hurry off to conceal their treasures.



could be seen, as they "shook the fist" in proud derision of their enemies.\* Standing there, in the presence of so many of the places which Isaiah has mentioned, it required but little aid of the imagination to seem to see the moving forms of warriors, as they spread themselves over hill and valley, and to hear their shouts of defiance, as they came on, impatient to begin and end the strife which, as they imagined, was to crown their enterprise with the possession of the holy city.

#### GERIZIM AND EBAL.

A mountain, the ancient Gerizim, springing up to the height of about eight hundred feet, guards the entrance of the valley on the left hand, and another, which is Ebal, nearly as high, stands on the right. It was on these heights that Joshua, in obedience to the command of Moses, assembled the tribes, soon after their arrival in the promised land, to utter responsively the blessings and curses of the law. See Deuteronomy 27:11, and Joshua 8:33, 34. The hills are at such a distance from each other that it has been judged that the voices of the speakers, in a clear day, might have been heard distinctly from one summit to the other. It was from the top of Gerizim, in the rear of the town, where it is not so high as nearer to the plain, that Jotham delivered his fable of the trees to the men of Shechem, to reprove them for their folly in making Abimelech king, (Judges 9:1, sq.) The language of the account deserves notice. He "lifted up his voice," it is said, "and cried" unto the men of Shechem. With such an exertion of the voice he could easily have been heard by the people of the city; for the hill so overhangs the valley that a person from the side or summit would have no difficulty in speaking to listeners at the base. This fact refutes the objection that the statement in the book of Judges involves a physical impossibility. Later history mentions a case in which soldiers on the hill shouted to the people in the city, and endeavored to instigate them to an insurrection. There is something about the elastic atmosphere of an eastern clime which causes it to transmit sound with wonderful celerity and distinctness. Gerizim was the holy mount of the Samaritans, (John 4:20,) where they built a temple, which they regarded as the true place of worship, in opposition to the temple at Jerusalem.

---

\* Nob was, not improbably, on the northern ridge of Olivet, whence the invaders would obtain their first sight of Jerusalem.

## JACOB'S WELL.

But that which gives to this locality its most sacred interest is the continued existence here of the well where our Saviour held his memorable conversation with the woman of Samaria. I have no doubt whatever of the identification of this well; the various local proofs which point to that spot, and the uniformity of the tradition, furnish an amount of testimony respecting the question too strong to be set aside. The Saviour was journeying, at the time, from Judea to Galilee, (John 4:4, sq.) and, as he passed through Samaria, would cross, naturally, the plain of Mukhna. It was noon-day, "the sixth hour," and, being wearied and thirsty, he sat down at the mouth of the well. There, too, I sat down, and taking the record of the "gracious words which proceeded from his lips" on that occasion, I read it, amid the surrounding objects, not only with new interest, but with a perception of the points of connection between the narrative and the outward scene, which left on my mind no doubt that it was the place where Jesus conversed with the Samaritan woman. The well is near the western edge of the plain, just in front of the opening between the hills where Nablus, the site of Shechem, is situated. Before me, therefore, as I sat there, was the town from which the people came forth, on the report of the woman, to see and hear the prophet for themselves. Behind me were the fields, then waving with grain, but at the earlier season of the year when Christ was there, recently ploughed and sowed, which rendered his illustration so natural: "Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields," (referring to the people,) for they are ripe already to harvest." My curiosity to taste the water I could not gratify, on account of the old difficulty; "the well is still deep, and there is nothing to draw with." I threw a stone into the mouth of it, and could hear it rumbling away in the distance, as it bounded from side to side, until it sank, at last, in the water at the bottom. It has been ascertained to be at least seventy-five feet deep, bored through the solid rock. "In this mountain our fathers worshipped," said the woman, and the Jews say, "that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." How abrupt, how vague, is this reference to a mountain, as it stands in the report of the conversation. But it all becomes definite, intelligible, as we read the history on the spot. There is Gerizim just at hand, at which the woman pointed at the moment, or glanced with the eye, as she uttered these words. In short, John's narrative of the occurrence at the well forms a picture, for which

one sees that the perfect framework is provided, as he looks around him, in front of the hills which enclose the modern Nablus.

A church stood, anciently, over this spot so hallowed once by the presence of the Saviour, The common tradition supposes it to have been built by Helena, the mother of Constantine. It was erected, certainly, at an early period; for Jerome, near the close of the fourth century, in his sketch of Paula's pilgrimage, says that she came to Shechem, and entered the church that stood over Jacob's well. The ground there is slightly elevated, like a platform, showing the space which the edifice occupied, and building stones lie scattered around, formerly wrought, no doubt, into its walls or foundations. The original mouth of the well is no longer visible on the outside; a vaulted roof having been built over it, through which it is necessary to descend, in order to reach the proper entrance of the excavation. The aperture is barely large enough to allow a person to crowd his body through it. The neighboring Arabs, ever on the watch to observe the approach of strangers, take care to keep a heavy stone over the opening, so as to obtain a reward for assisting to roll away the barricade.

#### THE DESCENT TO JERICHO.

Many single expressions occur in the Bible, which reveal the accuracy of the writers in speaking of places, and their relative situation, with reference to each other. One example of this I find in the parable of the good Samaritan. It is said that "a certain man was going down" (so the tense of the Greek verb should be rendered) "from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, who stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead," (Luke 10 : 31.) The valley of the Jordan, where Jericho was situated, is about four thousand feet lower than Jerusalem. After crossing the dry bed of the Kedron, the traveler passes over the southern slope of the Mount of Olives, and then commences a descent which is hardly interrupted till he reaches the plain of Jericho.

The mode of describing the inverse journey from Jericho to Jerusalem is equally exact. Having crossed the Jordan from the eastern side, Jesus, as we read in Luke 19 : 28, and Mark 10 : 32, "went before" the disciples, "ascending up to Jerusalem." We have the same phrase applied to the road between the two places in Matt. 20 : 17, and Mark 10 : 32. So, also, in the Old Testament, we find a like unstudied observance of the same geographical relation. Thus, the



Kenites "go up out of the city of palm-trees [Jericho,] with the children of Judah, into the wilderness of Judah," (Judges 1:16;) Shimei and the Benjamites, with the men of Judah, came down to meet David, who had recrossed the Jordan, after the defeat of Absalom, (2 Samuel 19:16, 17;) Barzillai refuses to go up with the king to Jerusalem, (19:34;) Naaman goes down from Elijah to the Jordan, (2 Kings 5:14;) which are only some of the passages that might be quoted.

#### SCENE OF THE PARABLE.

It may be mentioned here that the scene of the robbery which calls into exercise the benevolence of the good Samaritan, is referred, very justly, to the region between Jerusalem and Jericho. It is famous, at the present day, as the haunt of thieves and robbers. No part of the traveler's journey is so dangerous as the expedition to Jericho and the Dead Sea. The oriental pilgrims who repair to the Jordan have the protection of an escort of Turkish soldiers; and others, who would make the same journey, must either go in company with them, or provide for their safety by procuring a special guard. Hardly a season passes in which some luckless wayfarer is not killed or robbed in "going down from Jerusalem to Jericho." The place derives its hostile character from its terrible wildness and desolation. If we might conceive of the ocean as being suddenly congealed and petrified when its waves are tossed mountain-high, and dashing in wild confusion against each other, we should then have some idea of the aspect of the desert in which the Saviour has placed so truthfully the parable of the good Samaritan. The ravines, the almost inaccessible cliffs, the caverns, furnish admirable lurking places for robbers; they can rush forth unexpectedly upon their victims, and escape as soon almost beyond the possibility of pursuit.

#### TRANSMISSION OF SCRIPTURE NAMES.

The transmission, through so many centuries, of the biblical names of places in the holy land, is a standing monument of the truth of the Bible. It is hard to extirpate the aboriginal names of a country. The race which is spreading over British India, at the present day, when they plant a new town, now and then give to it a new name. The old places, on the contrary, retain their old names. The Romans, who extended their arms over Gaul, Britain, and parts of Germany, originated but few, very few of the names now borne by the cities and villages in those countries. Even when the earlier inhabitants have disappeared before the new comers,

as in the case of the Etruscans in Italy, or the Indians in some parts of America, they have left traces of their language behind them. Our own mountains and rivers, with their Indian appellations, are not more enduring than the proofs that an older race inhabited these shores before our forefathers came to them. If, then, the records of the Old Testament are true, the successive waves of conquest that have swept over Palestine, can not have obliterated all the marks of early times. If the towns, mentioned as existing there in the age of Abraham, Joshua and David, existed really, it must be possible to identify many of them still. As, on the one hand, the impossibility of finding any trace of them now would discredit the sacred historians, so, on the other, the discovery of the same names applied to existing localities, their preservation, notwithstanding so many invasions of Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Persians, Saracens, Crusaders and Turks, who have overrun the country at different times, becomes a striking witness to the truth of the Scriptures. I will not undertake to state numerically how large a proportion of the towns mentioned in the history of Joshua's conquest of Canaan occupy their ancient site; but, considering the antiquity of the record, it is surprisingly great. To these, of so early a date, should be added others first noticed in the Old Testament or the New, at a later period. They bear the same names as in ancient times, slightly changed, in conformity with the Arabic, the spoken language of the East. Even in cases where, during the reigns of the Seleucidæ and the Ptolemies, some of the Scripture places received Greek names, they generally lost them, in the course of time, and regained their proper oriental applications. Hameth, (Joshua 19: 35,) known in the age of the Greeks as Epiphania, Tadmor (2 Chronicles 8: 3) as Palmyra, Rabbath Ammon (Deuteronomy 3: 11) as Philadelphia, are examples of this tenacity of the East in asserting the rights of its own language, and rejecting foreign innovations. Indeed, these changes appear never to have been current among the natives of the country, and ceased as soon as the power which had imposed them was broken. In a few instances in which towns in Syria have Greek names at the present time, as Antioch, Tubariyeh, and some others, it will be found, almost universally, that the towns were of Greek origin, or founded by those in the Greek or Roman interest, and, consequently, had no previous names of which they could be dispossessed.\*

---

\* Compare the remarks of Gesenius appended to Burckhardt's *Reisen in Syrien*, vol. i., p. 483.

The chief requisites for establishing the identity of a place are that the modern name be the same as the ancient one, or deducible from it, and that the situation agree with what is said or implied on that point in the Scriptures. The geographical notices of the Bible, even in regard to places very ancient and comparatively obscure, are sometimes remarkably specific. Thus, in Judges 21 : 19, it is said that Shiloh, where the ark of the covenant was kept, in the days of the Judges, was "on the north side of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem and on the south of Lebonah." I lodged at Bethel on the night of the 28th of April; on the next day, at the distance of a few hours north of Bethel, I turned aside to the right to visit Shilun, or Shiloh, and soon after passed, on the left, El-Lebun, the Lebonah of Scripture, as I pursued "the highway" to Nablus, the ancient Shechem. The identification of this last place is made out with entire certainty by a process of historical combination, and in a different way, therefore, from that adopted in most cases, and described above. At Main, the Maon of Nabal, (1 Samuel 25 : 2,) near Hebron, the traveler has in view, at once, at least seven, not improbably nine, different places which retain their ancient names, but slightly modified. Among these, besides Maon, are Semua, Attir, Anab, Schuweikeh, Yuttah, which correspond respectively to Eshtemoa, Jattir, Anab, Socoh and Juttah, all mentioned in the early book of Joshua.

Besides the foregoing examples, in order to show more fully the nature and the extent of the resemblance between the ancient and modern names, I subjoin the following list, placing those with the modern or Arabic orthography on the right, those with the Hebrew or Greek on the left.

Anta, . . .	Anathoth.	Gib, . . .	Gibeon.
Akka, . . .	Acco.	Hulhul, . . .	Halhul.
Askulan, . . .	Askelon.	Humman, . . .	Hammath.
Beit Sur, . . .	Beth Zur.	Jebna, . . .	Jabneh.
Beit Lahm, . . .	Bethlehem.	Jeba, . . .	Geba.
Beit Ur, . . .	Beth Horon.	Jelbon, . . .	Gilboa.
Beisan, . . .	Beth-Shean.	Jebah, . . .	Gibeah.
Bireh, . . .	Beer, Beeroth.	Jenin, (probably)	En-Ganim.
Deemaskh, . . .	Damascus.	Jibia, . . .	Guba.
Deburieh, . . .	Daberath.	Jufna, . . .	Ophni.
Endur, . . .	Endor.	Kana(unchan'd,)	Kana.
Esdud, . . .	Ashdod.	Kdurmul, . . .	Carmel.
Gazur, . . .	Gesur.	Libnan, . . .	Lebanon.
Ghuzzeh, . . .	Gaza.	Ludd, . . .	Lydda.



Mejdel, .	Magdela,	Sarafend, .	Sarepta.
	Migdol.	Selwan, . .	Siloam.
Mukmas, .	Michmash.	Sur, . . .	Tyre.
Nasirah, .	Nazareth.	Solam, . .	Shunem.
Neckev, (per-		Tekua, . .	Tekoa.
haps)	Neckeb.	Tubariyeh (of	Greek
Nein, . . .	Nain.	origin,) .	Tiberias.
Ram, . . .	Ramah.	Urtas (prob-	
Riha,* . .	Jericho.	ably) .	Etam.
Saida, . . .	Sidon.	Yafa, . . .	Joppa.
Salim, . . .	Salim or Sha-	Yalo, . . .	Ajalon.
	lim.	Zerin, . . .	Jezreel.†

I mention the foregoing as examples only of the similarity which they illustrate, and mention these in preference to others, that would be equally pertinent, because they happen to be among the places which it was my good fortune to visit or have a sight of. What is worthy of special note is, that many of these names have been brought to light recently. Some of them have hardly been mentioned in books since they were last mentioned in the Bible, till the present century or the last. Geographers and tourists have traversed the land, and, as they have asked the inhabitants to tell them the names of their villages, have had the old Scripture names given back to them from the mouths of the people.

#### TESTIMONY OF RITTER.

It cannot fail to gratify the reader to know the opinion of the celebrated Ritter, the first of living geographers, in regard to the manner in which the Bible has maintained its character for accuracy under the severe scrutiny which it has undergone, from the progress of modern researches in Palestine. He has recently declared his testimony, on this point, the substance of which may be comprised in the following statement.‡

\* Though these words appear so unlike to the eye, the ear finds them quite the same; as Riha has a strong guttural pronunciation. This remark applies to some of the other names.

† I cannot refrain from bearing testimony here to the very great value of the "List of Arabic Names of Places" appended to the third volume of the "Biblical Researches." They were collected and arranged by the Rev. Dr. Smith, of Beirut, as the fruit of inquiries made in the course of various journeys in all parts of Palestine, during a period of several years. The traveler, who would obtain a knowledge of the ancient and modern topography of that country, whatever other helps he may forego, should not omit to carry with him a copy of those "lists," so remarkably full and accurate.

‡ In a discourse delivered at Berlin, entitled *Ein Blick auf Palästina und seine christliche Bevölkerung*, (1852.)

In the book of Joshua, he says, which relates the conquest and distribution of the land of Canaan, the geographical character is predominant. Its contents, therefore, in this respect, admit of being brought to the test of comparison with the ascertained condition of the country; and the result is, that its accuracy has been fully established in the minutest details, even when the examination has been pursued into the most unimportant and trivial local relations. Its notices, not only of distinct regions, but of valleys, fountains, mountains, villages, have been confirmed, often with surprising certainty and particularity. The entire political and religious life of the Hebrews was interwoven in the closest manner, like a piece of network, with the geography of the land, far more so than is true of the modern European nations; and hence the opportunity to verify the alleged or implied connection between places and events is the more perfect, and affords results the more satisfactory. Most decisive is the rebuke which infidelity has received from this new species of testimony; it has been compelled to confess with shame that it has imposed on itself and on others by the unfounded doubts which it has raised against the truth of the Scriptures. The authenticity of the historical books of the Old Testament has been shown to be capable of vindication on a side hitherto too much overlooked; their fidelity in all matters within the sphere of geography places a new argument in the hands of the defenders of Revelation.

I pass over the details of Ritter's illustration; he gives one of a very striking character, taken from the account of Joshua's second campaign in the south of Palestine, (Joshua 11: 16 sq.; 15: 21, sq.) He shows that the division of the country there into five parts, the scene of that expedition, rests upon a basis in nature, upon a diversity of geographical position, which none but an eye-witness could have remarked, and which modern travellers find to be entirely characteristic of the region still. He shows, in addition to this general accuracy in the outline, that the specialities are equally true; that many of the cities and towns which are mentioned have remained under their ancient names to the present day, and, also, occur together in groups, precisely in the manner that the sacred writers represent them as having been arranged of old. Of an hundred examples equally in point, the foregoing, he says, is only one.

Worthy to be connected with this testimony is the candid avowal with which Lieutenant Lynch closes the account

of his exploration of the Dead Sea, and the neighboring region. "We entered upon this sea," he says, "with conflicting opinions. One of the party was sceptical, and another a professed unbeliever of the Mosaic account. After twenty-two days' close investigation, if I am not mistaken, we are unanimous in the conviction of the truth of the Scripture account of the destruction of the cities of the plain. The conclusion we have reached," he adds, "I record with diffidence, as a protest against the shallow deduction of those who would be unbelievers." \*

---

\* See the close of the eighteenth chapter of his Narrative.



## ART. VIII.—NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, Containing, 1. Remarks on Christianity and the Gospels, with particular reference to Strauss's "Life of Jesus." 2. Portions of an Unfinished Work. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1855. 8vo. *A Translation of the Gospels*. With Notes. In two vols. By ANDREWS NORTON. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1855. 8vo. We can do little more, at present, than simply announce the appearance of these beautiful volumes. They are among the finest specimens of book-making we have ever seen in this country. The paper, typography, and binding, are all of the most perfect kind, in which respect they do great honor to the respectable house from which they are issued. They may be regarded as the complement of Mr. Norton's labors on the New Testament. His work on "The Genuineness of the Gospels," reviewed at length in this journal a number of years ago, is, with some slight exceptions, one of the best works on the subject in the English language. This fact, in connection with the well known learning, patience and candor of the author, will create an interest in these posthumous publications. The treatise on the Internal Evidences of Christianity, in many particulars, is inferior to that on the Genuineness of the Gospels. It assumes a basis altogether too narrow for the conclusion which it supports. The argument, indeed, can scarcely be called *internal* at all, as it is chiefly historical, and ignores some of the deepest wants, and some of the profoundest convictions of the human soul. While advocating the supernatural origin of Christianity, it denies the inspiration of the Record; and thus opens here and there, in the citadel of truth which it professes to defend, great chasms into which the enemy will not fail to enter.

The Translation of the Gospels and the Notes are valuable for their suggestiveness, though containing many obvious, yet ingeniously defended errors. They will be interesting chiefly to scholars. Mr. Norton's version, by departing so completely from the common English one, assumes an alien and forbidding aspect. Some of the translations are quite felicitous, while others are capricious and forced. Some of them are mere glosses or paraphrases. For example, in the sermon on the Mount, we have, "Blessed are they *who feel their spiritual wants*." In John 1, 14, instead of "And we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father," we have, "We beheld his glory, *such as an only son* receives from a Father." Instead of "And of his fullness have all we received," we have "Of his inexhaustible store have all we received." The Lord's Prayer, with its fine lyrical burst of devotion at the close left off, is thus rendered, no doubt *correctly* enough, but with all the grace and simplicity of the common version lost. "Our Father in Heaven, may thy name be revered. May thy kingdom come. May thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give

us this day our needful food. Forgive our offences, as we forgive those who offend against us. Bring us not into trial, but deliver us from evil."

The Notes are learned, and in many respects valuable. When not warped by his peculiar views, they are frequently strikingly just as well as suggestive. His views of baptism are thus candidly expressed. On Matt. 3: 2, which he translates, "He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire," he says: "When John says, 'He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire,' we must recollect that the ancient mode of baptism was by plunging into water. The meaning of these words is, that Christ would come, as the dispenser of spiritual blessings, in which those who received them would be, as it were, baptized, while they who rejected those blessings would be destroyed, baptized in fire."

The Editors of these volumes have performed their task with ability and discrimination. Fragmentary in some particulars, they are rendered as complete as possible, by a careful collection of passages from his other works.

---

*History of the Holy Bible, from the Creation of the World to the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.* By JOHN FLEETWOOD, D. D. (New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1855. Imperial 8vo, pp. 683.) We have in very substantial form, a new edition of a well known work. It is unnecessary for us to say anything in commendation of an author so universally approved as Fleetwood. It is enough for us to say that if our readers want a history of Bible times, events, and personages, they can scarcely do better than to procure this volume. The value of the original work is here much enhanced by the ample notes, historical, critical, and philosophical, gathered from a great variety of sources, and intended to elucidate the more difficult passages of the sacred history. Though these notes are not from the most recent sources, they are highly important, and tend to clear up many points, which might otherwise seem doubtful or obscure. The volume is issued in good style, and evidently intended to meet the wants of the great mass of Christian readers.

---

We have also from the active press of the same house, *The Miscellaneous Works of the Rev. Matthew Henry V. D. M.* (2 vols., imperial 8vo, pp. 1304, 115.) Matthew Henry is known to the religious world, chiefly by his excellent Commentary on the Scriptures. Many are not even aware, perhaps, that he was the author of various other works in themselves valuable, and at the same time, voluminous. Such will be glad to hear of these goodly volumes. Appended to the works of Mr. Henry is a collection of forty sermons by his father, the excellent Philip Henry, on "What Christ is to the Believer." Those who have used Mr. Henry's Commentaries will need no assurance that these writings are sound in doctrine and evangelical in spirit. Though containing some things from which we must earnestly dissent, we yet cheerfully commend them to our readers.

*The Select Works of Rev. Thomas Watson, containing his celebrated Body of Divinity, in a series of Lectures on the Shorter Catechism, and various sermons and treatises.* (New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1855. Imperial 8vo, pp. 776.) We need do no more than announce these Lectures of Mr. Watson, comprising his well known Body of Divinity. Every minister ought to read them. And no work can be more suitable for private Christians. This volume is accompanied with an ample analytical Index.

---

The Carters have also made the Christian public their debtors by issuing in a substantial style, Baxter's celebrated work entitled *The Saint's Everlasting Rest*, with a Life of the Author and an Introductory Essay, by JOHN J. CARUTHERS. (New York: 1855. Imperial 8vo, pp. 662.) This is the work of Baxter as he published it, without abridgment. It was in such meditations as this work contains, that the pious author found solace amidst the sorrows, oppressions and conflicts of his stormy and eventful life. While the huge bulk of Baxter's controversial writings are not without their value as defences of the truth, and are more valuable still in their bearing on the history of theological and ecclesiastical development, it is by such works as the one before us that he is most generally and favorably known to the Christian world. Thousands of saints have been edified in prosperity, and sustained in adversity, by the view which he has given of the rest that remaineth for the people of God. We thank the publishers for giving us this valuable work without the alterations which have been made in all former American editions.

---

*The Church: in a Series of Discourses* by Rev. SYLVESTER JUDD. (Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1854.) The late Mr. Judd, pastor of the Unitarian Church in Augusta, and author of "Margaret," was a man of genius, and with some faults and oddities, possessed a genial and generous nature. Poetical and fanciful, he had great descriptive powers; but lacked breadth and comprehensiveness of mind. His discourses on the Church are poor specimens of reasoning, and contain statements and conclusions of the most extravagant kind; but they are neither tame nor feeble. Here and there are fine suggestions and radiant flashes. He argues against all distinctions between the Church and the World, advocates not only infant Church membership, but *universal* Church membership. He would have the whole community, owing to its "birth relation," join the church. Nay, in some sense, he maintains, that every one is "born into the church" as he is "born into the state."

---

*Eutaxia: or the Presbyterian Liturgies: Historical Sketches.* By a minister of the Presbyterian Church. (New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855. 12mo, pp. 260.) This work, from the pen of the accomplished Mr. Baird, son of the Rev. Dr. Baird, supplies some curious and interesting information respecting the liturgical forms and prayers of the Presbyterian Churches on the continent of Europe, as also in Scotland and other places, in former



times. When one of the kings of France asked an ecclesiastic what he thought of the playing of cards, the wily favorite replied, "Sire, there are many arguments for it; many arguments against it." A similar remark, might, without equivocation, be made respecting forms of prayer. This, however, we can not now discuss. It is sufficient for us to say that the present volume is prepared with care, and will repay the attention of those curious in such matters.

It is a coincidence somewhat curious that while some of our Presbyterian and Congregational friends are urging the importance of liturgical forms for their worship, many of the most earnest and evangelical Episcopalians are making strenuous efforts to have their liturgy modified, and to obtain the privilege, in certain cases, of discarding it altogether. We have no room to remark on this singular aspect. We content ourselves with the statement of the fact, leaving it to carry its own moral and make its own impression.

---

In this connection we notice another work of similar character: *The Bible Prayer Book for family worship and for private and public occasions*. By W. W. EVERTS, D. D. (New York: Ivison and Phinney. 1855. 12mo, pp. 224.) This latter volume is not designed as a liturgy for general use, yet it is adapted to many of the occasions of public worship. We can conceive of no harm as likely to result from the use of such helps as this work affords, while to many it affords real advantages. Dr. Everts has executed his task with equal piety, taste and judgment.

---

*Primitive Piety Revived, or the Aggressive Power of the Christian Church*. A premium Essay. By HENRY C. FISH. (Boston: Congregational Board of Publication. 12mo, pp. 249.) A benevolent gentleman, impressed with the need of a higher type of piety in the Church, placed at the disposal of the Congregational Board of Publication, a premium of two hundred dollars, to be awarded to the person who should produce the best essay on "the more perfect exemplification in Christian life of the doctrines of the Gospel, and with special reference to the conversion of sinners." The committee of examination and award were, Rev. Dr. Humphrey, of Pittsfield, Mass., Rev. Dr. Ide, of West Medway, Mass., and Rev. Dr. Hawes, of Hartford, Conn. Among several manuscripts put into the hands of the committee, this by our friend Rev. H. C. Fish, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Newark, N. J., was deemed to be the best. We need add nothing further in the way of commendation. But we cheerfully bear our testimony to the value of the work. We have read it with some care, and concur generally with the author's views. We will take occasion to say, however, that our reliance on "statistics," so called, is less implicit than that indicated in this work. In our judgment, the comparative estimate which the author gives of the Catholic and Protestant churches in this country, is misleading, inasmuch as it does not take into account the immense accession to the numbers of the Catholic church, by emigration. A proper discrimination in this particular would afford a juster

impression of the real aggressiveness of Catholicism and Protestantism, respectively. We believe that the evangelical churches have a little more than kept pace with the natural increase of our population; though, with the emigration added, they seem to have fallen behind. This emigration is all against the Protestant churches, and nearly all in favor of the Catholic church. If one more circumstance be considered, we shall have the elements of a more accurate comparative estimate of the aggressive forces of the two systems. This is, that the numbers which our author gives include for Catholicism, the entire Catholic population of our country, infant and adult, while, for Protestantism, they include only adult communicants. We think that Mr. Fish has also been unfortunate in taking our large cities as the basis of his estimate of the religious condition of our country. Our cities do not present the largest aggregate in favor of religion and morality. Our religious state is vastly better than appears when viewed from such a point. There are several other things in this connection, which we feel compelled to question. Take, for instance, the statement in reference to the number of abandoned women in the city of New York,—a number which would lead to the conclusion that three-fourths of the adult male population of New York are involved in the infamy of prostitution. We are sorry to see these tendencies to exaggeration in so excellent a work. What Mr. Fish says, in reference to the necessity of a higher type of religious character, and of a general and sweeping work of revival in our churches, will meet with a universal response from Christians and ministers of every name. We hope this little book will be read, and that the blessing of God may attend it.

---

*The Philosophy of Sectarianism*, or a classified view of the Christian Sects in the United States, with notices of their progress and tendencies. By the Rev. ALEXANDER BLAIKIE. (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855. 12mo, pp. 362.) This is a remarkable book, but we are sorry to say that it is remarkable in no good sense. It evinces a degree of ignorance, arrogance, bigotry and intolerance absolutely stupendous. In his estimation there is no church but the "Associate Reformed" (Scotch Presbyterian.) Mr. Blaikie objects to the use of Cowper's beautiful hymn, beginning "There is a fountain filled with blood," which he denounces as a "plunging effusion," evidently supposing it to have been written by a Baptist, or as he chooses to name us, "Immersing Congregationalist."

---

*The Covenants*. By R. B. C. HOWELL, D. D. (Charleston: Southern Baptist Publication Society. 1855. 12mo, pp. 135.) The readers of this Journal will remember to have seen in a recent number an article by Dr. Howell on the Covenants. The volume before us contains a more extended and ample view. The subject is an important one, and the author has discussed it in a candid and discriminating manner.

---

*Life and Discourses of Rev. Thomas Spencer*. By Rev. THOMAS RAFFLES, D. D., LL. D. (New York: Sheldon, Lamport & Co. 1855. 12mo,

pp. 490.) Mr. Spencer was undoubtedly a young man of rare endowments, though there is nothing remarkable in the sermons contained in this volume. His untimely death undoubtedly enhanced the interest which attaches to his memory and literary remains.

---

Of a higher style, and of greater permanent value, are *Sermons of Rev. Ichabod S. Spencer, D. D.*, late Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. (New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855. 2 vols. 12mo, pp. 473, 479.) These sermons are evangelical in spirit as well as scriptural, and will serve to enhance the reputation which the author enjoyed while living. They are accompanied with a well-written and appreciative Memoir of Dr. Spencer, by Rev. J. M. Sherwood.

---

*A History of the Christian Church.* By Dr. CHARLES HASE. Translated from the Seventh German Edition. By Professor CHARLES BLUMENTHAL and the Rev. CONWAY P. WING. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 8vo, pp. 720.) Dr. Karl Hase, whose compend of Church History, well known to scholars, is here reproduced in excellent style for the use of English readers, is Professor of Theology in the University of Jena. He was born in the year 1800, at Steinbach. In 1823, he was a private instructor in Theology at Tübingen, from which the extreme rationalistic divines of Germany have received their name. It is but justice to Hase to state, that though somewhat rationalistic in his tendencies, he has ably opposed the common rationalism of his contemporaries. In 1829 he was elected Professor of Philosophy in Leipsic, and in 1830 he became Professor of Theology at Jena. Inferior to Neander in spirituality and reverence, and attaching too much importance to the naturalistic elements in Christianity, he possesses great vigor, comprehensiveness and candor of mind, and has presented a high, but glowing picture of the progress of our holy religion. Incapable from his personal experience of entering into the deeper life of the church of Christ, he appreciates its beauty and powers, both in its relation to individual characters, and the interests of society. His work is brief, exceedingly condensed, and in some portions meagre and imperfect. Like most of the German church writers and their admirers, he has great contempt for "the sects," especially those of more modern date, and though intending to be accurate and fair, presents but a sorry picture of the English Puritans, Baptists and others. It is amusing to notice the manner in which he refers to our own denomination, and particularly the labors of Oncken, in Germany, whom he designates as the "English Missionary Oncken!" In this respect, his translators, obviously men of high culture, are not much better informed. Indeed such writers as Hase, and particularly Schaff, with their "churchly views," are incapable of doing justice to anything beyond the pale of what they call "the historical church." The merit of Hase consists in his comprehensiveness and general accuracy, in his admirable arrangement, in his clear and elegant style, and in his brief but beautiful pictures of eminent characters.



We here take occasion, however, to say, that it is high time that the Scholars of "the Sects," and particularly those of our own denomination, should betake themselves not simply to the *study*, but to the *writing* of Church History. In our view nothing is so much needed, and if from timidity, or fastidiousness, or indolence, we neglect our duty in this respect, we must be prepared to suffer the consequences.

The Appletons, whose publications, in their style of execution, do them great credit, have issued the work before us in handsome form.

---

*The Temporal Power of the Pope*, is a volume containing the celebrated speech of Hon. J. R. Chandler, of Penn., on that subject, and nine letters reviewing the same from Dr. M'Clintock, the accomplished editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review. Dr. M'Clintock shows from Romanist writings of the highest authority, that the Pope not only claims spiritual supremacy but political supremacy also, over the faithful in all lands, and under all forms of government. (New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1855. 12mo, pp. 154.)

---

We are compelled by our limited space to omit notices of many books now lying on our table. We can only allude to some of the more prominent among them, reserving further notice till a future number.

Messrs. Phillips, Sampson & Co., of Boston, have completed their fine edition of Dr. Lingard's *History of England*, in thirteen volumes duodecimo.

They have also issued the first part of an elaborate *History of Massachusetts*, by John Bang. This volume is well written, candid, and edited with unusual care. They have published a work which will be of value to Physicians, by the veteran Dr. Geo. Hayward, entitled *Surgical Reports and Miscellaneous Papers*; two additional volumes of Woodworth's Miscellany, Byron's Childe Harold, and Mrs. Stowe's May-Flower and Miscellaneous Writings.

H. Mansfield, of New Haven, Conn., has issued Robert Philips's *Life, Times and Characteristics of John Bunyan*, with an Introduction, by Rev. S. D. PHELPS, D. D. (8vo, pp. 597.) We have no space to dwell on this noble volume, but can not refrain from alluding to the really superior style in which it is sent forth. The Introduction by Dr. Phelps, is well written, and the book deserves patronage.

Harper & Brothers, New York, have published several important works during the last quarter. Among them we note Maury's *Physical Geography of the Sea*, Loomis' *Practical Astronomy*, Madden's *Memoirs of the Countess of Blessington*, Huc's *Travels in the Chinese Empire*, Miss Strickland's *Queens of Scotland*, Vol. 5th, containing a continuation of the life of Mary Stuart, Abbott's *History of Napoleon Bonaparte*, in two splendidly illustrated octavo volumes, and Bancroft's *Literary and Historical Miscellanies*.

We have received from Messrs. Bangs, Brothers & Co., New York, volume third of Bohn's Edition of *Philo Judæus*, volume second of Conde's *History of*

the *Dominion of the Arabs in Spain*, Suetonius' *Lives of the Twelve Cæsars*, Demosthenes' *Oration on the Crown*, Pliny's *Natural History*, volume first, and the fourth volume of *Addison's Works*.

J. S. Redfield sends us in a compact duodecimo, *Life of W. H. Seward with Selections from his Writings*, and two volumes of the *Miscellaneous Writings of the late Dr. Maginn*, containing the celebrated "O'Doherty Papers."

We have received from C. S. Francis & Co., in a large octavo volume, *Hedge's Prose Writers of Germany*, and Zschokke's *History of Switzerland*.

From Carlton & Phillips, Methodist Book Agents, we have received an excellent book, with the rather forbidding title of *The Young Man Advised*, by E. O. HAVEN, D. D., and a crack-brained affair entitled *The Patent Hat*, "designed," we are told, in the title-page, "to promote the growth of certain undeveloped bumps, and thereby increase the thinking, reasoning, acting powers of the wearer." This is intended to be satirical, but it is simply ridiculous. The head of the man who wrote it is past the aid of hats of any description.

We have received from D. Appleton & Co., Gillespie's *Treatise on Land Surveying*, comprising the theory, developed from five elementary principles, and the practice with the chain, &c.; a valuable work amply illustrated; *The Chemistry of Common Life*, by James F. Johnston, in two volumes, duodecimo; Mrs. Jameson's *Common Place Book of Thoughts, Memories and Fancies*, original and selected; *The Brief Remarker on the Ways of Man*, by Ezra Sampson; *The Golden Reed, or the Measure of the true Church*, wherein B. F. Barrett attempts to discountenance the current Christianity, and set up Swedenborgianism in its stead; Emile Souvestre's *Leaves of a Family Journal*; *The Winkles; or the Merry Monomaniacs*, by the author of "Wild Western Scenes;" and an excellent story entitled *My Brother's Keeper*, by Miss A. B. Warner, author of "Dollars and Cents."

We have received from R. Carter & Brothers a volume entitled *Preces Paulinæ*, or the Prayers of the Apostle Paul; *Rich and Poor*, and other Tracts for the Times, by Rev. J. C. Ryle, B. A., and an excellent *Memoir of John Frederick Oberlin*, by Rev. Luther Halsey.

We have received from James S. Dickerson, an admirable book for the young, to which we can barely call the attention of our readers; *Harry's Vacation; or Philosophy at Home*, by William C. Richards, A. M.

We have from Crosby, Nichols & Co., Boston, a work which deserves some notice, and to which we shall endeavor to devote some attention in our pages at a future time: *Christianity, its Essence and Evidence*: or an analysis of the New Testament with Historical Facts, Doctrines, Opinions and Phraseology, by George W. Burnap, D. D.

Messrs. Ivison and Phinney, New York, send us Willson's *Outlines of History*, illustrated by numerous Geographical and Historical Notes and Maps—a valuable text-book; Sander's *Young Ladies' Reader*, for the use of Female Seminaries; and *The American Debater*, being a plain exposition of the principles and practice of public debate.

Messrs. Farmer, Brace & Co., have just published a valuable scientific treatise on *Human Physiology, designed for Colleges and the higher classes in schools*, by Worthington Hooker, M. D.; *Elements of the German Language, based on the Affinity of German and English*, by Elias Peissner; *Elements of Geometry and Mensuration*, by James B. Dodd, A. M., and *Elements of Astronomy for Schools and Academies*, by John Brocklesby, A. M., Prof. in Trinity College, Hartford.

Messrs. Roe Lockwood & Son, of New York, send us two elementary books in French, which we take pleasure in commending to our readers: *The Whole French Language* and a *Key* to the same. The works are by T. Robertson, and belong to what is known as the "Robertsonian System." These volumes are issued under the editorial supervision of Louis Ernst.

---

In the place of our usual summary of Foreign Literary Intelligence we can note only a few of the more important works issued recently in Europe:

Jashar: *Fragmenta Archetypa Carminum Hebraicorum in Masorethico V. T. textu passim tessellata collegit, ordinavit, restituit in unum corpus rediget, Latine exhibuit, Commentario instruxit.* J. G. Donaldsen S. T. D., Berlin. 1854.

Monumenta sacra inedita. Nova collectio. Vol. I. Et. s. t.: *Fragmenta sacra palimpsesta s. fragmenta cum Novi tum Veteris Testamenti ex quinque codd. graecis palimpsestis antiquissimis nuperrime in Oriente repertis. Ad-dita sunt fragmenta psalmorum papyracea et fragmenta evangelistariorum palimpsesta, item fragmentum cod. Friderico-Augustani. Nunc primum eruit atque ed.* Prof. Dr. A. Fr. C. TISCHENDORF.

Testamentum, vetus, graece secundum septuaginta interpretes ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pontificis max. editum, ad exemplar Vaticanum accuratissime expressum cura et studio Dr. LEANDER VAN ESS.

Theodoreti Episcopi Cyri ecclesiasticae historiae libri V, cum interpretatione latina et annotationibus Henr. Valesii. Recensuit Prof. TH. GAISFORD.

Pilati circa Christum judicio quid lucis afferatur ex actis Pilati; v. Prof. Dr. CONST. TISCHENDORF.

---

Those wishing to send orders for books, will find it to their advantage to notice the advertisement of WILLIAM K. CORNWELL, in the following sheets. Mr. Cornwell has extensive acquaintance with members of the trade, and will take particular pains to supply every article in the line procurable at the time the order is received.